LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 4 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division LA226
Section .S33

HIGHER EDUCATION
FACES THE FUTURE

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAR 4 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

HIGHER EDUCATION FACES THE FUTURE

A SYMPOSIUM ON
College and University Education
IN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

EDITED BY
PAUL ARTHUR SCHILPP

MCMXXX
HORACE LIVERIGHT·NEW YORK

COPYRIGHT, 1930, BY HORACE LIVERIGHT, INC.

MANUFACTURED IN THE U. S. A.

To All
Who Realize That
The Future of the United States
Depends Largely Upon
The American College and University

CONTENTS

PREFACE xiii
BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION 19

PART ONE

THE HISTORICAL EMPHASIS

1. American Education and the Occidental Tradition
Hartley Burr Alexander 31

2. American Education - Whence and Whither?
Tully Cleon Knoles 53

PART TWO

AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF EUROPEAN TRADITIONS

3. Integralism - *Sir John Adams* 75

4. Comment on a Basic Tempo
Baron Paul D'Estournelles de Constant 99

5. A German Looks at American Higher Education
Friedrich Schönemann 113

PART THREE

GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PROBLEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

6. The Upward Expansion of Mass Education
William Chandler Bagley.......... 135

7. Attributes of the College of Liberal Arts
Ernest Martin Hopkins.......... 155

8. The Inevitableness of Selection in Higher Education
George Edgar Vincent.......... 173

9. Humanistic Versus Humanitarian Ideals in American Education - *Irving Babbitt*.......... 187

10. The Most Critical Failure of the American College
Paul Arthur Schilpp.......... 207

11. The Functions of the Endowed Universities of America - *William McDougall*.......... 231

12. Social Education in the United States
Charles Abram Ellwood.......... 253

13. Philosophy and Education - *John Dewey*.......... 273

PART FOUR

AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF NEW VENTURES

14. Progressive Education in the Liberal College
Alexander Meiklejohn.......... 289

15. Creative Education - *Hamilton Holt*.......... 311

16. Self-Education in Harvard College
Abbott Lawrence Lowell.......... 327

17. Finger Posts of College Progress
Norman Frank Coleman.......... 341

18. The Newest Experiment in American Higher Education - *Robert Devore Leigh*.................. 357

PART FIVE

THE FORWARD LOOKING EMPHASIS

19. New Leaders Needed - *Dorothy Canfield Fisher*... 383
20. Higher and Higher Education - *Ray Lyman Wilbur*. 403

HIGHER EDUCATION HAS CEASED
TO BE OF INTEREST MERELY TO THE
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR
IT HAS BECOME A PRACTICAL PROBLEM
AFFECTING THE VERY EXISTENCE OF
CONTEMPORARY CIVILIZATION

PREFACE

If THE preface to this symposium on higher education in the United States of America were to serve as an introduction of its contributors to the intelligent American reading public, it would be so completely out of order as to place the editor of the volume immediately under rightful suspicion. It may be said at once, therefore, that, whatever other apologies may be necessary for the present symposium, the contributors stand completely vindicated by virtue of their own previous achievements. Any one who is even merely casually acquainted with the field of college and university education in the United States will have to admit that it would have been impossible to select a more prominent group of leaders of American higher education than is brought together within the two covers of this volume.

The editor does not, however, deny the equally obvious fact that contributions from other educators of like standing and reputation with those herein contained might have been included. Here three factors will have to be kept in mind. In the first place, it is manifestly impossible to include within the covers of one single volume the contributions of all foremost American educators. Secondly, a few of the leading educators in the United States who had been invited to contribute to the present volume found it impossible, in time for the planned publication of the present volume, to let us have a chapter which they would have considered worthy both of themselves and of the importance of the project. And finally, some of those who would most naturally have been asked to contribute to this project either had already published their findings concerning the present-day American college and university in book-form or were discovered to be at work at such an undertaking at the present time. Among the former of these are such volumes as *College or Kindergarten* by Dean McCann of Lehigh University and *The Awakening College* by former President Little of the University of Michigan, while the latter are represented by the planned, but thus far unpublished volume by President Morgan of Antioch College.

So far as the editor is aware, there has been only one previous attempt to deal with the present-day American college and university by means of a symposium. That is the volume edited by President Raymond A. Kent of the University of Louisville, Ky., which has been announced for spring publication of this year under the title *Higher Education in America* (New York, Ginn and Company). At the time our own symposium had to go to press, however, President Kent's volume had not yet appeared. It was impossible, therefore, to relate the same to the present undertaking, save to say that it would appear to be difficult to get too many expressions of authoritative opinions on this matter of higher education, a matter which is of such primary importance to the life of the United States.

The nature of the specific purpose and program of the present symposium the kind reader will find discussed in the *Introduction.*

Something, however, needs to be said about the order in which the various contributions are placed in this symposium. Since no topic was assigned to any contributor, and since there is no uniform plan or program underlying the project,[1] and since, moreover, there is not merely difference of opinion but even wide disparity of points of view, there could be no natural way of arranging the chapters except, perhaps, the most illogical of all ways, namely in the alphabetical order of the names of the contributors. This last mentioned possibility, however, was too manifestly meaningless to be considered seriously, even though it would have been by far the easiest way out of the difficulty. The arrangement finally decided upon must, however, also be taken as more or less arbitrary especially since several, if not indeed most, of the chapters might, with equally as much justification, have been placed in some other one of the five parts.

The unequal size of the five parts is, of course, to be accounted for on the basis of the same reason, viz., the complete independence of each individual contribution, which, for example, happened to result in two chapters of a mainly historical flavor and in two other chapters of a predominantly forward looking emphasis.

Even *within* each of the five parts the order of arrangement had to be quite arbitrary. While the reader may, therefore, with profit follow the order in which the essays are now placed, he may also read, with perhaps equally as much justification, in almost any other succession of essays which he may choose, provided that he begin with the *Introduction* and let the reading of any other of the essays be preceded by that of the two more historical chapters with which the book opens.

Should any one question the appropriateness of the title for this symposium, because only two of the twenty chapters appear under the fifth part, his attention need merely be called to the fact that, in a larger sense, every contribution contained in this volume is "forward looking." Every contributor who has written either of the past or of the present has done so because of his vital interest in the future development of American higher education and because he has been aware of the obvious — though sometimes neglected — fact that this future rests and depends upon past achievements and present tendencies. While, therefore, the volume is essentially one of stock-taking of the American college and university, this inventory has been undertaken all along the line with our eyes fixed on the future.

---

[1] The reason for this the reader will find explained in the *Introduction*.

The editor wishes to take this opportunity of acknowledging his grateful indebtedness to two groups of people without whom this volume would never have been possible. One of these, obviously, is the publisher, Horace Liveright, of New York City. This publishing house coöperated so generously with the purpose and program of this symposium and granted the editor such exclusive editorial freedom of choice in all matters of policy and selection of contributors that the editor cannot help but feel a lasting and permanent debt of gratitude. But publisher and editor alike would have been helpless without the magnificent coöperation of all the contributors. If the volume finally meets its original purpose it is wholly due to them. For their excellent contributions, timely coöperation, and never failing encouragement the editor has thanked them by personal correspondence, but he feels it to be the least he can do to repeat his gratitude here in public acknowledgment.

In the hope, then, that this symposium will help in the clarification of issues and in the attempted solutions of the present exceedingly numerous and varied problems of American higher education, the editor sends it forth

PRO EDUCATIONE MELIORE POPULI AMERICANI.

College of the Pacific
Stockton, California
May 1930

Paul Arthur Schilpp

By Way of

INTRODUCTION

BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION

By the Editor

EDUCATION, especially college and university education, shares front page interest together with religion and the machine-age. These three are probably outdone only by crime, sensation, prohibition, and sex. Of these latter, crime and sensation enjoy the intermittent interest aroused by the exceptional and occasional occurrence; while prohibition's ability to maintain a vital interest is largely due to checked appetites; sex alone presents the perennial problem among the "big four."

That education, religion, and the problems created by the machine should vie with each other in maintaining leadership of interest in the public eye in America to-day may rightfully be considered a cause for real satisfaction. For there can be no denying the fact that they present problems not only of first rate, but of positively paramount, importance in our modern world. That they should be subjects of widespread and common discussion, therefore, is certainly very gratifying. It indicates that our age is not only conscious of its problems but that this consciousness is prevalent in the very widest circles of American society. If there is any way at all by which we can get out of the impasse, which is generally admitted to have been reached in practically each one of these fields, it is probably more nearly by way of this universal consciousness of the reality and seriousness of these problems than by anything else.

Whatever may be said in comparing higher education in the United States with that in the various European countries, this much at any rate is emphatically obvious: not only does a tremendously larger percentage of our young people of academic age attend college and university than anywhere else on earth, but the interest of the whole population, even of those who neither in their own persons nor in that of their children have had or are having any higher educational opportunities, in our colleges and universities is something entirely unheard of in any other (certainly in any European) country. Were it not for this universal interest in higher education in the United States it would be impossible for books and magazines and even newspapers to keep the discussion of the college and its multitudinous problems in the center of things so much of the time.

It would, of course, be far overstating the case to assert that everything which is printed by the daily or weekly or even by the monthly press concerning present-day higher education is either very relevant or exceedingly important. In fact, much of this material which is so continuously flaunted before our eyes is of no particular value, except in that often it gives us a totally distorted point of view and thus helps in increasing the already too widespread confusion in these matters.

All of which, however, cannot change the fact that, if the amount of space given to the subject of higher education in the periodical and daily press is at all a fair indication of the people's interest in the subject, no other nation can even begin to approach us either in the universality or in the continuity of interest which the American college and university holds among our people. It is for this reason that I consider this widespread and continuous publicity salutary regardless even of the perhaps fairly high percentage of nearly worthless material which appears.

Nor should the fact be overlooked or considered insignificant that, for the last decade or more, much of both the printed and spoken discussion of the American college and university has taken the form of criticism, and of criticism, moreover, which many times has been both caustic and merciless as well as savage. And perhaps not the least significance of this apparently endless criticism may be seen in the fact that it has often been self-criticism, leveled by educators, trustees, and students (both present and ex-) against a system or a method or a situation under which they themselves were or had been suffering.

It is true, of course, that this criticism has become so much an everyday affair that it has come to be not merely accepted but actually expected and consequently has lost much of the effectiveness which it might have had at first. Too many of those engaged in the various processes of higher education are taking to almost any and every kind of college-criticism as a duck does to water; it runs off their backs without even touching the skin. And yet there is no denying the fact that many of the most worthy departures being made in at least some of college-procedures and college ways of doing things have come about as the result of not merely the mercilessness but even more so of the uninterrupted continuity of the criticisms leveled against college traditions, which latter many times had nothing more in their favor than the fact that they were ancient and accepted. The far-reaching effect of this college-critical mood of our age is even more obviously apparent in the totally new projects in college-education which, in recent years, have sprung up all over the country. In many ways some of these newer experiments in higher education differ so fundamentally from the customary American college and university standards and traditions as to lend themselves to no profitable comparisons with the average and ordinary American higher institution of learning. Whether any or most or all of them will finally be able to survive, it is entirely too early to predict at the present time. This much, however, may be asserted with assurance: even if none of these experiments in college-education should be able ultimately to survive in their present form, all of American higher education is bound to profit from these undertakings and from the results achieved by the experiments. For these experiments cannot help but acquaint us with facts and bring to light data which will be of the greatest possible value in shaping the higher education of America's to-morrow. The only way we have of finding out just what is and what is not *desirable* in higher education is to experiment. And the very fact that so many *different* experiments in college-education are being carried on at the present time in so many *different* parts of our country is, of course, the best proof not only of the effectiveness of college-criticism but — and this is far more important! — of the general dissatisfaction even within college-circles themselves with the present-day ordinary college and university education in the United States.

What are the reasons for this general dissatisfaction with to-day's American college? If we are to believe the myriad writers and speakers who bare their various griefs against the college and who never fail to get both the popular ear and the mob's applause for their jibes at the expense of our higher institutions of learning, the answer to our question would have to be: legion. Moreover, among this legion we should discover many contradictory statements, assertions, criticisms, and approvals. To listen to and believe all of them would spell utter confusion in any normal person's mind; to follow all of their recommendations for improvement and incorporate all of their positive ideas into any one actual higher educational institution would witness the creation *not* of a college, but of an institution of, by, and for the insane. Are we, then, to pass by all this criticism unnoticed or with a mere shrug of the shoulder? Such a reaction would not be so much fallacy as foolhardiness, yes, a crime. For where there is so much smoke, there must be a cause for it somewhere.

No, to close our eyes to the criticisms of our colleges and universities would be the next thing to suicide not merely for these institutions of higher learning but for the nation as well. A nation built upon whatever flimsy foundations of democracy, such as is true of the United States, cannot long survive the breakdown or even the general distrust of her higher educational system (or, if not system, then, at any rate, schools). In our most rational moments we *know*, and for the balance of the time we seem to feel *instinctively*, that the matter of our higher education goes to the very heart of the nation's welfare and survival. That is to say, when we do not realize this, we feel it. And it is this, perhaps mostly subconscious, awareness of the vital importance of education in the life of a modern democratic nation which undoubtedly accounts for the unending line of attack on to-day's college, on its methods, program, purposes, and goals.

We have every right, therefore, to congratulate ourselves upon the fact that this very sustained interest shown in our higher institutions of learning by a never ending stream of oral and written criticisms and attacks gives unmistakable evidence of the nation's, if not clearly defined then at least instinctive, feeling of the vital and inestimable importance of her educational institutions for her very existence.

But where, amidst this flood of good, bad, indifferent, and even contradictory criticism of our colleges and universities, shall the really thoughtful American citizen turn, if he would know the actual status of affairs in our higher institutions of learning? And where, among all the actual new educational experiments — not to mention the host of suggestions which are made for changes or improvements without yet having any actual experiment to carry them into effect — shall he go to get a really authoritative and, in so far as possible, unbiased and unprejudiced analysis and evaluation of these experiments?

It is mainly in an attempt to provide some really worthwhile and at least partially satisfactory answer to these questions and rightful demands of both the intelligent American layman and the harassed and overburdened American educator that the present symposium volume on American higher education has been planned. None of the contributors and least of all the editor would claim that this volume answers all rightful or even all inevitable questions which may be put concerning our higher institutions of learning. Still less does it intend to offer a final answer or solution to any higher educational problem.

What this symposium does do is much more important than either of these. *First* of all, it tries to face the facts concerning our higher education as frankly and as honestly as each contributor to the symposium finds himself capable of doing. Every contributor was not merely asked but urged to hide none of his real opinions concerning to-day's American college and its methods and program. *Secondly*, the volume has no ax to grind. There has been no attempt to achieve either unity of ideas or even general agreement. Rather, the contributors were definitely chosen with the idea of not merely variety but even possible contradiction in mind. Nor should it take the reader long to discover rather far-reaching and basic disagreements among some of the following contributions. Thus the intelligent reader can finally formulate his own opinions and conclusions, since he is not being made to swallow a set of predigested ideas, but rather finds himself confronted with a banquet of varying and even widely differing educational ideas and ideals. In the *third* place, in the present collection of essays the reader will find educational authorities express their ideas instead of a group of literary or social critics or other more or less poorly informed spectators of higher education from the side-lines. We have too long listened to quacks and to people who, too often, have ulterior motives in their criticisms of American higher education. It is high time that we should hear from those who not merely know, but who have proved their knowledge by doing, by noteworthy educational achievement. With the single exception of the editor of this symposium, all of the contributors belong to this group. Even Dorothy Canfield Fisher, while not a professional educator, has proved herself to belong to this group by her educational writings which have uniformly been of high merit. *Fourthly*, the contributors were chosen both from the administrative and the purely teaching fields of American higher education. So that even from the standpoint of this problem the collection does not present a one-sided point of view. In the *fifth* place, the authorities here brought together represent many different academic major interests, as is indeed quite obvious from their essays. The professional pedagogue, the psychologist, the sociologist, the philosopher, the literary critic and man of letters, the editor, the historian, and even the physician-scientist and statesman will be found to be represented in each case by one or more contributors to this symposium. *Sixthly*, most of the outstanding types of new higher educational procedure are represented by essays in this volume. And what is still better, these new and in general still experimental projects are here analyzed and described by the men who themselves were the respective originators of those educational ideas and who are themselves conducting these experiments under their own leadership and supervision. In other words, we are providing the reader not with second-hand reports but with first-hand information concerning the most important educational experiments being carried on in American higher education at the present time. And *seventh* and finally, three of the leading European countries are represented in this symposium by contributors who while themselves brought up in the higher educational systems of England, France and Germany, respectively, have yet had first-hand and sufficiently lengthy and varied experience with American higher education to be able to give a fair and helpful estimate and evaluation of our colleges and universities against the background of their own European education and tradition.

A volume so composed should fill a need which has long been apparent in thoughtful contemporary American life and literature. If it still leaves many a question unanswered, yes, even if it should raise more questions than it answers, it will yet have achieved its major purpose, if it will have helped to clarify the issues and to indicate possible and more desirable paths and methods of higher educational procedure. As has been pointed out elsewhere in this volume, worthy changes and improvements can be made in American higher education only *after* we have come to a fairly thorough understanding of two facts: first we must know where we are at present in our educational evolution; and secondly, we must determine the nature of our goal. The following essays will be found to contribute vitally and from many-sided points of view to such understanding.

PART ONE

THE HISTORICAL EMPHASIS

I

Hartley Burr Alexander

AMERICAN EDUCATION AND THE OCCIDENTAL TRADITION

I

AMERICAN EDUCATION AND THE OCCIDENTAL TRADITION

Hartley Burr Alexander

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, SCRIPPS COLLEGE,
CLAREMONT COLLEGES, CALIFORNIA

BY *the Tradition* I mean the whole transmission of European culture linking us back through time to the ancient Mediterranean from whose civilizations it gets its character, assimilative of all infusions on into our own day. The Occident possesses a unity and distinction, separating Europe from Asia even within their single hemisphere, and giving to Western life and art and thought a cast which is unmistakably its own, and is foreign to things Oriental. Whether, East being East and West the West, there is a question of superiority (or better of a balance of superiorities) one way or the other, is of very little moment to the folk of either division: the fact of difference is there, and with it is the duty born of the fact that each should make the utmost of its gift, not for its local aggrandizement but for the total glory of a mankind that will be the nobler for possessing all the heights of things human. There is an Occident and there is an Orient, each shaped by and shaping its own Tradition, and it is for each to make the most of its heredia.

Of course these Traditions change color with the passage and pressures of time; but less so through transformations than by way of shift of illumination and focus. Each resembles a constant landscape which alters its hues and intensities with the wheeling of its suns; the essential structures are fixed, it is only the lightings that create the new reliefs of that fundamental pattern which, magnifying with time, becomes the transmissible civilization that is the heart of the Tradition. The Occidental world, especially in its later centuries, has been expanding both geographically and structurally, almost with a feverish increase; and in this growth its powers of assimilation have been strained to a degree for which there are no more than two analogues in times past — first, when Hellenism captured the Mediterranean world, and second, when the trans-Alpine shift of civilization created the culture of the Middle Ages. But in its third great mutation Western civilization has undergone an even vaster dislocation, Europe becoming but the parent of a Colonial Occident which bids fair to become in its time the heir and transmitter of Modernity. The Americas are two of Earth's five continents, and when to these is joined an Austral and an Oceanic realm, all colonially European in culture, there needs but a minor prophet to foretell that the Western Tradition must eventually lie with the lands which define the seas.

Within this colonial expansion, the Nordic (chiefly British) and the Mediterranean (chiefly Hispanic) streams have nearly divided the larger Europe, mingling and separating in varying degrees, but nowhere unintelligibly remote from one another: in religion, in politics, in commerce and custom, everywhere they bear the impress of their kindred sources. Nevertheless, it was inevitable that the great wanderings of European peoples should have been accompanied by progressive lightenings of their carryings-forth from the homelands, and hence of progressive attenuations of the Tradition itself: to take but a simple, yet at the same time a profoundly significant, example, of the arts of Europe that which has been most preserved is its letters — for books are facile freight,— so that more than in their parent countries book-learning has in education and in life been made the vehicle for the idealistic elements in the colonial civilizations; and to this day it is only a return to Europe itself that can instruct the colony-born in the significance and integrity of the artistic expression that carries forward so much of the better meaning of the

Occidental achievement. In the colonial lands schooling has been shaped by this fact — much as in North America religion has been shaped mainly by the texts of the Book,— and probably to a noticeable degree Europe itself has come to lean more heavily upon its literate expressions from the mere fact that letters alone form a language of its culture well understood of its children. It is not the printing-press only that has made the Occident word-minded and has brought it to confound discourse with reason, but more than this the shared portions of its expanded life have perforce been made communicant primarily through the works of the press.

But limits of understanding have been set also by the new nativities. In every great literature an image and an interpretation of nature, as its authors know nature up from their own birth, has become embedded in poetry and science, in imagination and thought; but in lands where the face of nature has become radically altered the community that might lie through natural images fails and the eloquence fades from the letters. Nothing short of present vision can make the hill-towns of Italy conscious to an American or the Grand Canyon of the Colorado to a European. Before me now rise exposed, first the gray laminations of Pennsylvanian limestone, and above them the long layers of red Jura-Trias sandstone, capped by the blackish breccia and ocher tufas that form the mesa-tops and surfaces of the Jemez Plateau; a parallel series is European, but its names will be wholly of that other continent, and its significance can be only parallel. If in the descriptions of science this is inevitable, how much the more in a poetry which can never acclimate in America the English sky-lark or in Britain the Western meadowlark's sunburst of delight? Probably in this matter the most leaden impediment that colonial literatures have carried has been their solicitudes to fit the nature they know into European forms — for such has been the tyranny of a parent's fame, permitting only the most gradual of adoptions into the newer soils. Nevertheless, there has been a notable reaction, from child to parent, for the modern age in Europe has certainly derived the compelling phases of its conception of a nature that can be conceived as virgin from the colonial worlds, and along with this also its images of a human nature that is the expression of a natural man, freed from artifice and innocent of politics. Difficult is the assimilation for the dwellers in both regions; but in the end, and for the whole of the Occident, is being achieved a new sense of man's autochthonous life, regional rather than political in character, marginal to the continuous seas, and free under the skies. It is this, which in last resort is the human sense of our natural science, this which has created for us our image of Nature, and so has given to its interpretation a lasting significance in the Occidental pursuit of wisdom.

Here, then, we have two of the factors that have modified centrally the Tradition since the day when Columbus set sail from Cadiz; first, a vehicle thinned to mere literacy; and second, the discovery of another nature. But a third factor, also born of Europe's colonizations and certainly more intricate in its effects, is the reconstruction of the material aspects of life which has taken form as our industry and commerce, and thence as our polity and morals. An economic interpretation of history is never more than partially true, but obviously of no period of recorded time has it been more significantly a key than of the period of the expanding Occident. First, this expansion gave wealth and aggrandizement to Europe, and inaugurated an age of empires; but in its latter phase it is shaping colonial states, which with no small truth are becoming the wardens of their parents and even the judges of what in the parental life shall be preserved — a thing perilous beyond wisdom, for the cause of the Tradition is in weakened hands when it is given over to unseasoned heirs. Mainly this peril has been incurred, prematurely, as a consequence of the World War, which for Europe was as an act of abdication, hastening what in destiny is inevitable; but it is an event that can only be for the disquiet of the Occident as a whole, since not America, nor the sum of the colonies, is as yet so grown in an understanding of the inheritance as to be able securely to take it in charge. Proof of this and enough is the present-day blatancy of the economic agencies which unopposed, in Europe or elsewhere, proclaim their gospels of human welfare and shape institutions to make them effective. If disaster be before the Western culture it is because its more ideal gifts are being obliterated by the mass of its industrial and commercial affairs, and its arts, uninspired, are succumbing to its fads for things and pastimes. The world has never known such powers as the Occident now owns, and in hands made adept by minds well-nurtured its opportunities would be yet the greatest mankind has discovered; but in our actual hour opportunity is so balanced by peril that none dare say whether greatness or decline is before us, whether West or East is to guide the courses of the centuries into which we move. Most of all here, and especially for America, hope for the better rôle must be pinned upon an education infused with understanding; and this is yet to be found and formed.

Of the Tradition which is the heart and life of the Occident this, then, is to be said: first, that it is in an age of expansion which has both increased its substance and weakened its frame; and second, that its destinies have prematurely been given into the hands of heirs untrained. On the stuff of these heirs rests the fate of its future.

The United States possesses, if not the eldest, certainly the most developed of the colonial expressions of the European type of education. This is in both senses, as of the school and of the culture; for it is only selected phases of the Tradition that are confided to the schools; its major burden being necessarily carried by social institutions and the lore that grows with custom. Too readily we are given to the notion that education is a specifiable enterprise which may be given over uncritically to scholastic formulations and consigned to a profession for its interpretation; whereas it is only a total society that can possibly be genuinely the significance of a Tradition and only a social initiation that can honestly define education. Schools reflect social institutions, and institutions incorporate the valuations of life which characterize a civilization; and while it is also true that the higher schools — colleges and universities — are socially creative and give direction to culture, this is rarely of more than secondary moment and is far less because of their teaching of the young than because such schools are centers of discovery in scholarship and science and imagination. In fact, American higher education originated for the primary purpose of satisfying a social need for a man of a certain type, "the professional man," and for long it adhered to the simple Medieval pattern,— theology, law and medicine forming a learned class in a society which could understand religion, politics, and medical science as Tradition-made. It is true that along with the higher, a common-school training (trivium and quadrivium in form) grew up to lift into a more effective coöperation the citizen-commoner; it is true again that the colleges acknowledged, locally and faintly, an ideal of the "cultivated man" best known by the evasive values of taste and acquaintance; and it became true, as knowledge grew in complication, that every type of engineer, mechanic or social, began to find also collegian preparation; but in these, as for the elder and professional types, the pressures which framed the schooling lay in the self-evidences of a society which already possessed its understood values. And in the United States certainly another and unschooled type, the "self-made man," the man of enterprise and ingenuity, rose up to reflect a set of valuations for which not the Tradition but the imperatives of a building life in an unkempt continent were chiefly responsible. Here was a man educated by life itself, deriving his ideals from the contexts of his day, influenced by the ideals which lived in the Tradition, but little familiar with their sources, and because of his achievement admitted into every counseling of perfection. The greater American heroes are of this metal, and whither the heroes move thither society turns its course.

It is this fact, that the ideal American has been the man of enterprise rather than the man of judgment, knowing the how more swiftly than the why of an action, that has definitely restricted schooling to a position of subserviency. In Europe the great schools took form first within the church and later under the patronage of princes, in each case with a sanction of authority beyond ordinary question; they shared the allegiance which states temporal and spiritual exacted, and came to be and are virtually in the charge of a priesthood — for the position of the scholar or scientist to-day, as the European recognizes it, is essentially that of a priest of the Tradition, and the colleges are priestly houses living under their own rule with none other than the most seated of authorities to challenge their rights. In America the colleges are not only thumbed by enterprise, they are shaped to its uses, if not exclusively, yet materially; and it is only by permission (not by right) that they carry forward something of the age-grown meaning of the Occident. Where their foundations are not the gift of enterprise itself (as mainly they are), they represent the will of a community whose heroes are captains in the world of action, so that it is this world that they most reflect. But the world of action is perforce the realm of the ready and the up-to-date, and it can have little concern for what to it is the baggage of the years, and little pause to come to an understanding with the Tradition. It is this, most of all, which puts peril into America's share in the custody of Western civilization: on the scholastic side it gives us colleges which are more obviously aggregations of monuments than associations of minds, and the minds themselves, even within their province, are campus-bound and tagged; it gives us libraries that are press-product more than reading-hours, art that is the lumber of museums, a culture that too fluently becomes club-babble,—and all this set over against the honesty of a business whose files are too clogged to yield space to any past. Certainly this is an invasion into all that has created the greatness of the West — its religion, its humanities, its moral law, genuinely also its science, every achievement which has represented hitherto the Occidental Emancipation of Man.

Necessarily the virtues of colonists are the virtues of action; and where that action is as immense as the opening and rebuilding of a continent it should be beyond expectation that it should not breed just such an activistic philosophy of life as is in fact that of the contemporary American: he believes in work, and is contemptuous of the unindustrious; he confuses leisure with idleness, and is unable to discriminate its thoughtful from its pastime use; and yet more mischievous he measures success by the job done and esteems expedition as a mark of perfection. The most disastrous distortion of our modern economics-minded civilization is that labor is a sort of punishment to be compensated by a wages that is divorced from all sense of joy in work, or that business is a calculation in commodities having but a showing of profits (balance-sheeted) as the sign of its success,—no judgment of the actual living of the most vital hours of the men in the enterprise being taken into the reckonings, nor of human interests for their humanity's sake; and it is this distortion which most besets such a society as America's, where the virtues of reflection are reduced to their minimum, every hour held suspect. Of course we know (in the lip-service fashion) that the maturity of a culture is always determined by its thoughtfulness and never by its quanta of mechanic motion, and that a true humanity is unpurchasable by wage or profit; but neither in our life nor our schools has this knowledge borne fruit: it is but phrase echoed without conviction. None should be deluded, as to this, by the fact that there are, in America and the other colonial countries, numbers of individuals who have the fuller understanding, and who direct their efforts toward a truer steersmanship of the souls of their peoples; there are such, not without effect; but as yet the effect is insufficient to weigh heavily, or to veer the course. The colonial capitals are still "Middletowns," and the populations are unhoused proletariats; so long as the frontier endured, their tasks were understood and imperative, but with these erased through conquest, only restlessness and feasting remains: a gigantism of energy, an infantilism of aim,—this is the major formula of the colonial Occident in the hour when it is summoned to command. To flatter the situation with the euphemism of a philosophized activism is but to betray the poverty of its thought as with a conscious blush; deed without understanding is no more mind than a hurly-burly of shouts is discourse.

But all this is surely only the temporary stage, only the mark of the immaturity. Indeed, what less could possibly be the outcome of such an effort as Occidental civilization has put forth in its conquests of its unimagined territories? The actual accomplishments are stupendous — perhaps only to be likened, for their greater human significance, with the expansions of Neolithic man following the centuries which discovered agriculture and made civilization at all possible. Further, even with the inevitable neglect of the dearer elements of the Tradition, the stay and substance of the colonies is still what has been brought out of its fathering past into the newer lands. This is, most profoundly, those moral convictions which have become ingrained as sentiments, deeper than *mores* because, past custom, converted into mind-color: the European sense of man-value lies here, carrying with it every stripe of political or economic esteem of freedom; the European understanding of reason (which is also in type a sentiment) is not less an ingrained character; and, of all most important, there endure those ideals of chivalry and gentility and nobility in impelled conduct which have been so strangely transformed out of their origins, and have made possible an Occidental delineation of heroism and of glory. Whatever else we lose, these latter so long as they be retained, must maintain us as men and as civilized; and it is from their constancy that we gain hope for our future: they *are* our youth, and the stanchion of our self-faith.

No doubt it is some better sense of this, here in America, when the country is suddenly flung into a responsibility that dazzles every wit, which is acting first to arouse conscience. Most of all this is in evidence in the present-day attitude toward education. Here is not a mere concern for the schooling of youth, important as that must be. Rather, it is most deeply set toward a reillumination of the public mind — and in its human even more than its citizen traits. We have discovered our own poverty of understanding of our own intrinsic culture, source and branch; but to our fortune, we have made this discovery without loss of confidence or pride in the thing itself. Hence, everywhere in the United States to-day there is a setting-about toward the finding of the Way of the West, the Way which shall lead into a renewed and more ennobled floruit of the Occident. It is in terms such as these that the problems of education are being conceived; they have become the affairs of statesmanship, for us and for our world.

WRITING these words I am seated under the canopy of a camp tent high up the canyon of the Jemez in New Mexico. The camp, of some thirty tents, shelters toward seventy persons, staff and students of the Field Session in Archæology conducted under the joint auspices of the School of American Research and the University of New Mexico. For the past three weeks we have had for fellow students the members of the Field School in Biology whose camping-ground is a few rods distant from ours — near enough so that we have all shared, commensally, the purveyance of a single kitchen, conveniently set up in the shack left by lumbermen of times past, and have shared, too, in campfire symposia and have interchanged lectures, biology and archæology mutually illuminative. For the season this is now past, for the biologists are descended to study the life of lesser altitudes (we are here toward seven thousand feet), while the archæologists stick to their last, the ruins of Unshiagi ("One seed-Juniper Town") ten minutes down the road. The ancient inhabitants of north central New Mexico evinced an almost uncannily sagacious sense of natural beauty in the selection of their dwelling sites, and the founders of Unshiagi were no exception: very near the exact center of our camp is the metal marker which divides the National Forest from the Lumber Company's lands, so that we sleep under one jurisdiction and dine under another, and the swish of the torrent — which can rise and fall in volume and turbulence with amazing rapidity — is always in our ears, a true voice of nature, scenic with the pines. There is a waterfall and a clear spring perhaps a hundred yards distant, whence the Indian boys bring us our drinking, and two miles upstream is a natural bath of endurably hot water which is constantly patronized, although the chill pools also allure the bathers. The hot springs are, no doubt, the senescent last-breathings of the pre-Tertiary Titan who laid down the vast capping of basalt and tufa in the days of his vulcanic might, and scalded from earth's surface every trace of life. But life is tremendously resurgent, and gazing up from our camp which lies on the floor of their great cup we see from stream-bed to the highest crest of the mesas — a good fifteen hundred feet above — the almost continuous green of piny forests. Our biologists have been telling us that the camp is wonderfully pitched for the study of zones — although we have to thank the olden Indians for all that, thank those who first built here; across stream, on the south slope, where the mesa rises almost sheer from its limestone base, the forest is sprinkled with juniper, its grayer cast modifying the brilliant green of the yellow pine, and this is the characteristic vegetation of the upper Sonoran Zone, where the arid lands break into glades; but the northern slope, back of camp, is far more densely wooded, and here grow the tall pines, the spruces, the firs, leading rapidly up into the zone called Canadian, because here the vegetation of far northern forests stands like an intrepid rearguard of long-retreated glaciations. Ours is the transition zone, where the rigid North and the renewing South hold battle, and the one soil nurtures age-long hostiles. No doubt, even if unconsciously, the founders of Unshiagi were in part persuaded to build on the rock below us not alone because nature is here beautiful, but also because she is generous, adding berry and nut and game to the provender of squash and pumpkin, bean and maize, borne by the rich soils of the little fields which they cleared for their annual crops: we are finding them now, vine-seed and corn-cob and the carbonized kernels, in the pathetic burial hords, there where the jars were broken and the sherds left to lie with the bones of children and women and men, long ago.

Our advertised subject is archæology, with the pre-conquistador ruin for its laboratory; but our actual theme is the meaning of human life. We think that this can be best understood in a scene where nature and men meet and contest and compromise, coming to their mutual understanding,— as eventually must be also for the great cities, many-throated. In their day the people of Unshiagi understood this, as the objects about their altars testify; and in our day, we understand it,— for better than a day we were isled by the torrent, and the quarrel between the clouds and the road-menders is unceasing, with time out for all of us. Actually we do learn, and it is barely possible that by the end of our season nature would not deny us were the whole munificence of the world of canned goods to fail — as, without bringing depression, news and newspapers have failed. The man from Washington (he is an attorney and seasoned) is unmoved by the perturbations of stocks and of affairs: it is all so remote and unexciting, he says; life is not in that dimension, at least not in its primary sanity.

He is here with his wife and daughter; and there are others, from New York, from California, and from a score of intermediate stations; one hearkens the soft drawl of New Orleans and the nervous staccato of the Middle East along with the more rolling tongue of the several Wests. The students (there should be another word; "student" has become official and scholasticized, and here is but meant minds-seeking-guidance) are of every year, from first college on into the grays, so that the camp personnel reflects very near the whole active range of the tempers of thought. There is, to be sure, the concession of "credits" to the collegians, coming from some twenty-two of our universities and other higher schools, Atlantic to Pacific; but this is genuinely a concession, not an advertisement; the purpose of the Field School is not diplomas but understanding. America, of summertimes, is filled with restlessness; no one is quite satisfied with his nine-months achievement; it rings empty, and the feeling is everywhere that life has somehow been cheated; the starters sound, the wheels turn, and the population, face-wearied, seek some emancipating out-of-doors that may bring an inner renewal of the great national hope that our faith in enterprise is justified. The Field School is an invitation to a fraction of such folk, for its few weeks throwing into a nearer illumination a more autochthonous life, felt to be more genuine perhaps because its simpler factors are susceptible of a synthesis which for our national world is still far remote. Here, then, is one of America's experiments in self-education, seeking along newer frontiers to acclimatize the colonial spirit to its chosen soil: the forests are felled, the fields plowed, the towns built; but all this is surface-platting; the deep adoption which only nature gives, rooting life in soil, is yet to celebrate.

Anterior to the Field Camp in my summer experience falls a three-week in the session for adult education in the University of California. There again is an experiment, and a groping after inner discovery. In this case the site is no camp in the wilderness, but a great American "educational plant," monumentally splendid, and in Berkeley redeemed by a spacious beauty that can accommodate without distress gregarious thousands of registrants. The "adult education" school formed but a cellule in this vaster organism. As in our Field Camp there was community life of teachers and students — or shall I say of editors and contributors, for the value of the work came less from the men catalogued for the courses than from the ready response of the registered, who were in the main themselves teachers in the numerous "adult" and "evening" classroom undertakings by which the public schools everywhere are seeking to give belated openings into the gates of learning to those for whom opportunities were denied in their earlier years: folk such as immigrants, men and women of eager mind to whom the pressures of the economic tyranny prematurely closed schoolroom doors, or just those late-awakened to the significance of the Tradition, in earlier years mistaught or neglected; there were even, among the adult-session students, teachers whose work was in prisons or with "inmates," and from these came no dim illumination of the social densities that hammer from men's minds their humanity.

Adult education got its vogue in the United States as a by-product of the World War. It began, backed by self-righteous and uninformed bureaux, as a blind and tyrannous thing called Americanization (with nothing that *is* America understood or taught), and it should have been only brutal and mischievous had it not led to the high discovery that America does not know herself and is insistent to know, and that everywhere there is a veering toward an understanding that is not of the tricks-of-a-trade but of the affairs that befit a civilization and a people: teachers who set about "Americanizing" after the pattern, become enlightened through their contacts and emancipated by events, and have come to seek for themselves the power to satisfy or at least share in the quests which are in the minds of men and women whose discontents are deeper than economic or political. For the moment there are innumerable bye-wanderings, into cultisms and occultisms, into fads and fictions, with every voice on every forum; but the unrest is in itself hale and token of that self-confession of ignorance which is the beginning of wisdom. In the pioneer days America owned a good-humored and often jocular self-confidence which was in fact justified by its competence to achieve its work, gigantic in scale but simple in formula, of the surface-conquest of the continent; but the newer and more tremendous task is of the discovery of a spiritual life for the physically enseated people, and to make America great in time as she is spacious in spread; dimly men are awake to this, stirring, and awaiting their dawn. This is the significance of the new movement for adult education; school-years are not enough for understanding; the range of a lifetime is meager as a learning-time; and indeed it is seen ever more clearly that the Great Education must be of a people in its endowed maturity, if ever men are to ascend into their Sun. Of course there is a peril; and here it is that which in the United States is ever-imminent, of making an institution out of what should be living thought, —in other words, the *profession* of teaching is the menace of learning, and in the hands of its directorates is ever the threat of foreclosure upon the mind's domains. Eternal vigilance is no less the price of wisdom than of liberty. But where men seek, there promise is.

The summer events are symptomatic of our national mind, knowing itself awash and striving to right the keel. I speak of them with detail because they are contactually mine while in fact symptomatic. Mine also is twice a school-year with one of the many colleges opening new doors or shaping new programs, likewise symptom of that dissatisfaction with the state of the mind's affairs which now we may regard as national. Scripps College began life in 1927 with a living-house for fifty students and catch-as-catch-can accommodations for a handful of professors: it was *not* to be mere schoolroom. Two years of continued building have given it "plant," but the idea is at the outset to find in the college the importance of a moment of life, not some fanciful "preparation" leading to its fictive "commencement" of the solid affairs. Now the significance of that moment is and can be just one thing: a reservation against the future of a time which is sufficient to make growingly familiar some sense of the Tradition which *is* the core of our civilization and the base for its future building. The Field Camp locks us in with nature, as should be; the adult movement takes the temperatures of the social organism, and gives some inkling of its state; but all this were idle therapy had we no means of effectively keeping strong our linkage with the sustaining Past. Vaguely, so far as its understanding goes (and, usually, in the multi-thousanded universities of the land contrary to the proclamatory voice and the official admonition), college life in America is still in conscience justified from the fact that it does permit a season of withdrawal from the noise of affairs and of reflection upon their meaning. It is true that the more swollen institutions pronounce themselves to be lesser worlds, congesting all the sins of polities, and so (as serpent-sheltering Edens) inducting the young into that one valid wisdom which is worldly. But in the actuality this is mostly institutional noise, only blindly affecting the genuine function of such schools, which is to give to youth its season of prospect enlightened by retrospect, thus to judge, and thus to be able with something of bettered understanding to carry forward the living spirit of Occidental humanity. Fundamentally, the Humane Letters cannot be displaced without relapse into barbarism, and if the collegiate officials do not know this, at least the students do.

Scripps rests its case with this assumption. Its first task is to hold with the humanities and with our recognition that learning is not only a heritage but a heritage of a sort, which it is ours to better or to worsen. This does not at all mean that it is harking back to ineffectual patterns or accepting every limitation which the sayers of wise saws would impose; the elder methods with the Classics are neither practicable nor desirable, even for the few who elect the linguistic path; life is complicated beyond that, and learning complicated. But there is an imperishable center, Classical and Biblical, Medieval and Renaissance, whose forgetting means our present relapse into barbarism; and at all costs this is to preserve. The new college, therefore, as of its right, plans its own organization of the humanities, set in the balance of its view of a life which must be seen with even illumination of Past and Present and Future; and it holds that in so doing it is showing troth with the collegiate task, which must foremost be the fortification of the Tradition in the mind of a citizen-youth: there is no other anchorage for social sanity.

So much for the confession of faith, looking toward some fresh mastery of the humanities of the Occident, some central preservation of the Tradition as rooting into colonial America. It is based upon the conviction that America possesses a color of Western civilization which is distinctive and should own a destiny; the matter of degree and measures is another thing; the quality is ours and we must hold to it. In a material way Scripps is a minor affair; it is designedly small, with an eventual limitation of accommodations for but two hundred and fifty students and with a conscious restriction of subject-matters. In this it is one among the many contemporary reactions against the congested halls and more congested curricula of the universities which for the most part are out of hand, planlessly confused by the variegation of their undertakings. Through device they are struggling toward simplification, toward the limited group and the limited curricular pattern,—toward an education with an idea backing it. In the case of Scripps the manner is distinctive, in part because it is parcel of a wider community; for the Claremont Colleges (of which Scripps is second, Pomona being the cornerstone) are to form a group, each member self-limited, each creating its own program and type, yet all contributing to the one university plan. Something of the sort is being attempted in larger universities which are directing their efforts toward subdivision of their mass into integral and intelligible unities —collegiate houses within the bulk; in Claremont a like end is being sought, but from the ground up: Pomona is a co-educational unit; Scripps seeks to define a type for women, or, certainly, to be individual for one ambition of women; a third college will be for men; but those facilities of each unit which can bear gift to the others will be, and are being, shared. But it is not the mechanics of the many undertakings that is of first significance; this has only to do with means. What can count, in the end can be only the ideas that emerge, charting what out of the past America can retain and what for the future create. The total problem is complex; life must be innerly acclimated to a new nature and a new understanding of nature; what time has added to human nature, what modernity has wrought into man, this also must be won into our self-understanding; finally, the Tradition, treasured out of its centuries, must be kept living in every trait that can be shining, and this is the most difficult of all. Here, for America, is its weakness and the trap of its destiny; and here, for its safety, is no better reliance than the college years which bring a withdrawal in order to insure an entry. The half-realized conviction of the public has created the temporal period, and given it a four-year as measure; but its effective content is yet to define.

The educational undertakings which I have indicated, in each case very small and very local, are at least symptomatic of the American unrest with what has been and its groping after fresher forms of social understanding. Only the conceit of an unimaginative and composed society could have long maintained our one-time satisfaction with the "three r's" and what was added to them by way of utility or fancy in a school-system which, whether with local pride or a playful patronage, was seldom regarded as much more than a convenient recess for the immature,—like a more established Boy Scouts or Girls Campfire, suitable for Kiwanian "uplift." The truth is that the real education of the earlier America was taken care of by the family and village communities, with their variety of frontiering self-provision and self-guidance, and in such a group the school could only add to what the manner of life of the people already afforded in the way of understanding; there the competition between the school-trained and the self-educated was with little favor to the former, for life was simple; and inevitably the school came to be, after its manner, a local luxury. The attitude of patronage with which the profession of teaching is still regarded in America is the long echo of this earlier situation. Necessarily, with the complexifications and specializations of society, the first condition passed: men no longer find in family or community sources of understanding sufficient to enable them to meet life or shape civilization (what, for example, batters about with a more amiable helplessness than American philanthropy?), and despite its failures the school-structure is progressively called upon to carry more and more for its share the graver legislations of our destiny. And the schools, to-day with a growing consciousness of their assignment, are reaching toward every frame and every agency that may aid their enterprise. The conception of education is enormously broadening, as the facts warrant.

The symptoms indicate the newer movement. From within schools and from without, it is envisaging the enlightenment of a whole people rather than merely of a youth. It has been thought, or perhaps without thought assumed, that the right life of a civilized community ought only to be platted by the men in their thirties and forties, the energetically mature, leaving the younger and elder margins of our human years with such crumbs of opportunity as the wastes of enterprise might afford; and it is this, without doubt, that most preserves in the United States its aspect of a veneered, if good-natured, barbarism,— for barbarians we are, and must remain, until the measures of life are seen as comprising the wholeness of a lifetime's days. It is, therefore, for the new education to reach first the men who have hands on affairs, and this is the essence of the movement toward adult education: it is the quest of self-education by a nation which knows itself to be ignorant and without leading. Schools are less and less being thought of as yards for the young, and the little social boundaries that are taped off by scholastic diplomas are passing into their proper insignificance. The finding of a vaster education is before us, incorporating a whole people, and having for its end the giving of a continent, spiritually, and for the whole of time, to our common humanity.

Now, in preparation, it is evident that America has much which it must recover out of its Old-World past. The immigrant who was to become a frontiersman — with ax and plow and yoke, like his Aryan forefather,— came stripped to the necessities; he relinquished centuries when he crossed the seas. But these centuries are now to find again, if America is to assume a rightful heirship or to nurture that which they have sown. Assuredly something of the Tradition has been consigned to us, and upon this we must build with every increment that can be regained from what we have failed to hold. There is, to be sure, a whole school of ready historians who are willing to say that men first began to be men with the Economic Revolution and that civilization finds its Year One when Watts invented the steam engine; and for them there is little that is worth thought anterior to the factories. But time and its events have already given the lie to this fancy, and even in the moment of its discovery the hegemony of economics is being denied; excepting only communist Russia, America is the most economics-minded of peoples, and here in America the prime significance of the quest for understanding is that it is essentially a soul-sickness of economic affairs; we are ear-weary and speech-weary of vocationalism as applied to schools and their curricula; and in life, as cities congest it, there are wistful multitudes eager for some plateau of mind whence markets and tickers, time-punches and cash-registers are banned. In the ideal city there is a mart for traffic; but above it, always, is a citadel, temple-crowned.

Actually human beings live on successive levels of mind. If where humanity finds its testimony only in bodily figure, then sense and appetite fill what of mind men possess, and dining is the one pastime. If beyond this they know a healthy and zestful physical activity, alive with perception and enterprise, then we know them as men of action, habile for what is before the eyes and keen to become engrossed in the Present of time; and it is on this level that most Americans live. A third elevation is into the mood and mode of reflection, with a gaze that looks over the bastions of a man's years, and a curiosity which asks questions that are of the eternal; there is many an early human society in which the *gerontes*, the elders, fulfill such a fruition of the mind's humanity, seeking an understanding that is beyond the personal and a composure which may be like to that of the stars. In all of these levels a man may live without asking more than his own nature-given resource, and in so doing he will be holding troth with his humanity. Nevertheless, at the best, he will be less of a human being, living even in due measure the three, than if he add thereto that fourth level of the mind's life in which he shall share what others of his kind have prepared for him — that accumulated work of mind which a civilization is. Probably there has never existed a civilized society in which the number who have understandingly known and carried forward the meaning of their culture has been proportionally great; the responsibility of the Tradition has rested with the few, and it is for this reason that civilization has ever been a thing precarious, threatened far more by the irruption of the barbarism within its formal confines than by any attack of aliens. As time has passed, for the Occident, effort has been turned toward the widening of the range of understanding within our societies; this is the core of the meaning of all our doctrines of emancipation and democracy, whether religious or political, economic or cultural. Peril has gone with it, the peril of debasement through currency; and perhaps in no community has this peril more been made actual than in the United States, and primarily because of its free public schools. These schools have constituted, in fact, a magnificent challenge to the whole of our civilization and to the whole nature of man, laying as their wager that a culture can be committed to the commons of mankind and can still survive without loss of quality. This is our highest attestation of America's faith in democracy, and with its proving democracy stands or falls for man's world. For as yet it is not proven; as yet we have not shown ourselves capable of upbearing the heights of the Tradition. Almost abruptly we are asked to arise and assume a broad share in its sustaining, and we find ourselves nearly destitute of its understanding. The fact that we know our ignorance is our best promise of eventual competence, though this of itself is not assurance; our barbarisms are deep-set, our understandings are thin-lain. But that the hour is to us is beyond question: upon our power to rise to it hangs the fate of a continent which may become the banner-carrier of the Occidental Tradition of Mankind or may sink back into the old, dulled levels, where thoughts are creeping things and men are human, if at all, only by the grace of God.

2

Tully Cleon Knoles

AMERICAN EDUCATION—WHENCE AND WHITHER?

2

AMERICAN EDUCATION—WHENCE AND WHITHER?

Tully Cleon Knoles

PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE OF THE PACIFIC, CALIFORNIA

FOR some time past American[1] education has been the continuous target of caustic criticisms both at home and abroad. At home this criticism comes in the main from two sources, from Americans who are cultured and acquainted with the ideals and standards of European education, and who deplore the numbers crowding into our colleges and the different, if not lower, standards of admission and of advancement. It also comes from the practical business man who has not only succeeded in life, so far as power and material rewards are concerned, but who has succeeded very largely with the coöperation of men who, like himself, are not college trained. He criticizes the lack of practicality in the college training and its failure to fit men immediately to step into positions of influence, power, and direction in the rapidly changing business world of our day.

The criticism at home is not directed alone at higher education, but at elementary and secondary education as well. The fear is that the American youth will be educated beyond the appreciation of work, and not up to the cultural level of a real participant in effective "white-collar" jobs, even if there should be enough of such jobs made available by the continuous process of the extension of machine production.

---

[1] By "America" and "American" I shall, in this essay, mean the United States of America. While this is not an accurate use of the term, it is briefer and more convenient, and will be followed here for these reasons.

The foreign critic, or the American critic who judges through foreign spectacles, is fearful not only of the failure of the American school system to produce culture, but he is fearful of the capacity of America to become cultured!

For both types of criticism a serious appraisal of the history of American education should be fundamental, but alas, almost universally comparisons are made and conclusions drawn without the least regard to historical facts, values, and perspectives. Therefore it will be my first task to give a few of the outstanding movements in American education with slight, very slight, attempts to prophesy concerning future developments as indicated by present trends. America is so young that her history is all known and she is viewed so critically by all the world to-day, especially by the European world, that certain values may perhaps be discovered by one who views her educational development not only sympathetically but also from an historical perspective.

Taken in its larger aspects, *the most outstanding feature of the evolution of American education is the fact that we are more interested here in schools than in a unified theory or system of education.* By system of education I mean a unified system of subjects, courses and objectives, with as near an approach to unified standards as possible; there are, therefore, as many systems of education possible as there are ends of the process thought desirable.

Scholarship is usually thought to consist in the possession not only of accurate information but also in the possession of an attitude of mind at once acquisitive and critical. There may then be a theory of education based upon scholarship.

Training in skills, either mental or physical, or both, is often thought desirable, and as a consequence we have vocational theories of education.

Culture is a term very difficult to define. Cultured men and women are not all educated in the same manner or to the same degree. The man of culture ought to be at home in any age and among any people whose history has merged into life's stream. Culture ought to indicate a growing appreciation of the good, the beautiful and the true. How attractive the cultural theory of education is can easily be seen by considering the following illustrations:

England has had (until the post-war period) a theory of cultural education not only based upon an aristocratic organization of society, but one which tended to perpetuate that system; and, therefore, England was not worried about a system of schools furnishing a tunnel from the elementary school on to the university. In short, the university has never cared how or when the student was prepared, the sole consideration has always been —is he prepared? But since the war Britain has realized her growing tendency toward democracy and has been building up a school system which shall make possible the education of a much larger proportion of her population through at least the secondary field. For while her growing spirit of democracy has modified her franchise exercise time and again, until in the recent election men and women voted on an equality, practically amounting to universal adult franchise, her schools had been erected and developed only to the extent made necessary to supply the needs of the old aristocratic theory of education. It is only necessary to point out the fact that the great "public schools" of England are in reality great private schools, to make this point clear. In our American conception of the term the public school of England is very backward, but her changed political situation will greatly modify her concepts, and if she continues in the direction of a democracy she must soon have a system of schools to fit her new situation. Her task then will be that of keeping the essential values of her old theory of education in the enlarging system of schools designed to care for all future voters. Her problem, stated in Dr. Meiklejohn's famous statement, is to "preserve excellence in a democracy."

Germany, on the other hand, since the foundation of the Empire has had a system of schools dovetailing perfectly into the German system of education.

As over against these, America does not have and never has had a theory of education. There are three reasons for this. In the first place, schools grew up with the growth of the colonies, and there was no unifying force in colonial America for anything. In the second place, in the organization of the Federal government compromises were necessary between those who desired strong centralization and those who desired particularism, and education, consequently, was left to local and state control. As the area of Federal activity has increased throughout the years at the expense of State activity, the field of education has not seriously been invaded. However, there is a strong tendency to-day toward the development of a Federal Department of Education. Several successive bills have been introduced in Congress looking toward that end, but this agitation thus far has been unsuccessful. In the third place, a unified system of education does not fit in well with ideal democracy, for democracy must have freedom of thinking, speaking, and publishing, hence freedom of teaching. An autocracy must have a theory of education and a system of schools controlled by itself to insure its own perpetuity; such was the German Imperial System and such was the old English system. An aristocracy must have control of a system of education to maintain itself; while a democracy cannot maintain itself on any other than a democratic principle, hence the essential difficulty of developing a unified system of education, even though the school system be very generally developed and very wide-spread in its diffusion.

My observation leads me to believe that America is coming toward Federal guidance and Federal fixing of minimum standards, while beyond this local and state units will retain autonomous administration. Therefore, it will be far in the future, if ever at all, that one may speak accurately of an American system of education. The diversity of peoples, local interest, problems of citizenship, of religion, and of economics, all tend to local and stratified development of schools, and in the attempt to live up to the standards set up by the various agencies will be found the only unifying influences. Hence the bewilderment of our European critics accustomed to scholarly or cultured ideals, with vocational theories in the main limited to the trade school idea.

The second outstanding fact in the story of American education is the growth of secularization. In the early days even elementary education was fostered and developed by the various religious denominations, while to-day the elementary field is very largely secularized. Parochial schools are maintained by a very few of the religious bodies and the number of pupils in attendance upon them now tends to diminish rather than to increase.

It is, in the perspective of American history, rather a startling fact that it was not until 1821 that there was founded a free public high school in America. However, when the American found out the method of the organization and development of the free public high school, he started the most distinctive element in the American school system and, without his knowing it, he started at least two most important trends, namely, the popularization of higher education and the growth of state universities. This will appear later.

The process of secularization of secondary education has grown amazingly. In the last report, June 1926, of the former Commissioner of Education, Dr. Tigert, there is given the figure of approximately 4,000,000 students in the secondary schools of the United States, and less than one-tenth of that number were in all of the private secondary schools,— independent, Protestant, and Roman Catholic. This shows conclusively two facts,— first, a tremendous enrollment in secondary schools, and certainly a favoritism for secular education in the secondary as well as in the elementary field, perhaps explained by the American's preference for taxation rather than benevolence. When the writer was a young lad in California he was a student at a Methodist Academy in Southern California. There was urged the starting of a free public high school. The trustees of the academy were thrown into a panic; they offered to give free tuition to all of the students in the proposed high school district who desired to attend a secondary school. The offer was rejected, so finally a school with about one hundred and twenty-five students, a good building or two, several acres of land and certain endowments were turned in to the trustees of the public school district. Last year's report for that school shows a junior college, a senior high school and several junior high schools with more than $2,000,000 in property, and lists a faculty of ninety-five for the high school with a student body of thirteen hundred and fifty-five! An institution of such proportion in such a place needs taxation.

As a further example of this growth of the free public high school may be cited the marvelous growth of the high school population in California. It was 10,000 in 1900; 14,000 in 1910; 49,000 in 1914; 95,000 in 1916; 162,000 in 1918; 238,000 in 1920; and over 400,000 in 1928! Of course that tremendous increase was not primarily due to increased passion for learning on the part of adolescents, but was stimulated by a state law requiring full time attendance until the age of sixteen, and part time up to eighteen, unless the pupil was graduated before that time.

This compulsory education through the adolescent period is being watched with real interest by all educators. It puts the children from various intellectual, economic, moral, social, and religious groups in a unified system of schools at the same time. Obviously there are at least three standards in every one of these schools, a standard for those who will be prepared for college, a standard for those who will graduate, but who cannot go on with academic education, and a standard for those who will drift along until the age limit has been reached. This phase of secondary education is spreading: whether for good or for ill it is a significant factor in the determination of the trend of American education.

In speaking more particularly of *higher* education it is very important for any real understanding of the American college and university to remember that all of our original American colleges were founded on a denominational basis, with one single exception, that of Girard College founded by Stephen Girard. The process of secularization is moving on in the field of higher education, but it does not have either the speed or the momentum which it has had in the elementary and secondary fields.

From the founding of Harvard and Yale to the Civil War period, with the exception noted, all higher education was under denominational auspices and was supported entirely by benevolence and by the payment of fees. After the Civil

War period the States began the erection of tax supported universities and vocational and professional colleges. The growth of these institutions in size and influence has been phenomenal. However, it is to be noted that in both the field of secondary and of collegiate education the well established and endowed academies and colleges of the East and Middle West have continued to prosper, while the farther West one goes the more dominant become the secularized schools of both grades, and in the Far West the tax supported high school is almost universal.

It has too generally been taken for granted that this process of secularization is proceeding with equal momentum and popularity in the field of higher education, but statistics do not bear out this assumption. Nevertheless, it is still true that the most of the students in colleges and universities are in institutions more or less affiliated with the various religious bodies. While many institutions originally closely affiliated with churches have completely secularized themselves, many others are tending in recent years to strengthen the ties which bind them to their founders.

Perhaps a few words in explanation of this whole tendency toward secularization would not be out of place. The United States has never had an established religion; therefore, state religious instruction is not possible, and while it is true that originally all secondary schools under state control had a form of religious exercise, such as the reading of portions of the Bible and prayers usually recited in unison, the tendency of recent years is for liberals in religion to unite with Catholics and Jews in curtailing these exercises, if possible, to the point of elimination; while the more conservative and fundamental elements in the democracy strive to restore the use of religious exercises or to provide for some coöperative method with the secondary schools for the securing of a minimum amount of religious instruction. Here the contrast with most of the European practices is very sharp, for in the main in Europe religious instruction is a part of the state system of education. So much so is this true that it was not until recent years that a scholar could receive a degree from Oxford University who was not a communicant of the Established Church. The attitude of public and established schools toward religion as presented by all other major countries stands in sharp contrast to that maintained by Mexico, China, Russia, and the United States. Our public tax supported schools are becoming less and less fields for religious education and, as has already been shown, in America millions of adolescents are receiving their education in totally secularized schools.

Our conclusion, then, is that in the field of higher education secularization seems to be halted; however, this conlusion may not be fully justified, for there is a rather steady growth of tax supported junior colleges which must be reckoned with in the immediate future.

Our next consideration has to do with the various objectives of the schools of different periods. Perhaps this discussion should be prefaced by the statement that all educational reforms seem to originate in the field of higher education and then gradually work their way down into the secondary and elementary fields. That is to say, the departments of education and of psychology of our colleges and universities develop and popularize educational theories which they hand down to their subordinates or to those who are to teach in the lower grades of the schools. And in America where the school system has been so organized as to permit of uninterrupted passage from the first grade of the elementary school on up through the university, it is only necessary to discover what was the dominant university idea for a period, in order to locate immediately the dominant idea of the lower schools for the succeeding period.

Moreover, most of the ideas dominating the life and program of the universities were taken over from the Old World. For example, all of the original colleges in America were attempts to imitate the English schools, but the attempt at imitation was futile. The students did not have the home cultural backgrounds nor inspirations, and the colleges did not have the libraries nor the faculties for successful reproduction of the British cultural breadth of reading and sympathy. But there was developed a discipline of the textbook and of the classroom, and that discipline has not been appreciated fully by the critics of American education, for there was nothing that could be set up as a criterion by which it was to be judged. The fact is most significant that about 45 per cent of the graduates of these colleges up to 1850 entered the ministry — many of the balance entered the other learned professions. Undoubtedly the collegiate training of the very few who could secure it made a very valuable contribution to American life; and American life after our Civil War certainly showed great virility and laid a real foundation for the America of to-day.

It is also a notable fact that up to our Civil War nearly all of our graduate students who sought further study in Europe enrolled in the English universities. It was most natural for this to occur with a common language and literature; and with many of the teachers English trained, the lure of the Mother country was strong. But after the Civil War the graduates who desired further training went to Germany in ever-increasing numbers.

The reasons for the change in the objective of graduate students seem essentially to have been two: first of all, the German universities furnished a much more hospitable reception to the new spirit of scientific inquiry than did the English institutions; and, in the second place, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy could be secured in Germany but not in England.

While it is true that England has furnished many scientific workers, and that they have been most successful in their research, yet it is surprisingly true that during the nineteenth century little of such research was carried on either within the universities or under their auspices. Exactly the reverse is true of Germany. The universities offered a home for the spirit of science, and research became the method of education. Freedom of learning meant freedom of investigation. This method was most attractive to American students not only because of their newly found love for science, but, it must be confessed, also because their previous training did not permit them to study in the English educational atmosphere on an equality with British trained students.

The extent to which the hegira to Germany took place can be measured adequately only by a just appraisal of the results of the working out of the Cecil Rhodes Scholarship

Plan. This undoubtedly was devised to restore the flow of the current to England. As attractive as are these Scholarships, and as splendid as are the resources of Oxford, the current has neither been stopped nor materially changed. On the contrary, the attractiveness of the Doctor of Philosophy degree grew with the years. The earliest recipients of the degree did not attach much importance to it at first; indeed, G. Stanley Hall once said that he did not let it be known that he had such a degree until he had secured a position as a teacher! But soon, naturally, the situation was reversed and a holder of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from a German university was almost certain of a good position in an American college.

It is true there is being waged a battle royal in American education between those who magnify the teaching function and those who magnify the research function. Indeed, there are some who go so far as to say that only those trained in research have anything to teach. Yet it cannot be questioned that there are great teachers who know little of research; and by the same token there are brilliant and indefatigable workers in the field of research who are very poor teachers. In the final analysis the whole question is largely a matter of personality and adaptability. Perhaps some day the degree of Master of Arts will become the degree of a teacher, and that of Ph.D. the degree of the University research director. That this need for a special degree for the *teacher* is already being felt in official administrative circles within academic walls may be seen by the fact that a few universities, of which Stanford University is a good example, have recently established the degree of Doctor of Education (Ed.D.).

The result of the introduction of German trained teachers had three very marked influences upon American education, not to mention culture. First, our colleges became universities, either in fact or, at any rate, in name; secondly, the discipline of the textbook and the classroom became subordinate to the discipline of the laboratory method; and finally, the popularity of the study of German language, literature, and political science grew by leaps and bounds.

Let us discuss these in order. There should be noted, first of all, the essential differences in the organization and structure of English and German universities. The English idea of a university is that of a collection of colleges more or less similar in their educational structure, activities, methods, objectives, and fields of study. Their function is to prepare students for the examinations to be given by the university as a basis for the awarding of the university degrees. The German universities, on the other hand, emphasize the breadth and freedom of learning in all fields. Nor are there any coördinate colleges in the German system. The various faculties are rather separate schools for separate disciplines, as of medicine, theology, law, etc.

The English university idea never really took root in America, which makes the very recent attempt to try out the idea in the Claremont Colleges, an expansion of a fine organization of Pomona College at Claremont, California, all the more noteworthy. This project, however, is too new to be used as more than an illustration of the tardiness which has characterized the appeal of the English method or organization, although elsewhere in this volume there undoubtedly will be found detailed and sympathetic statements concerning various attempts, more or less successful, to introduce even in the twentieth century the methods and theories of the English university technique of study and of cultural development. The various "honors courses" and other graftings on the American grown collegiate tree (of knowledge?) are cases in point.

Our German trained Doctors of Philosophy, on the other hand, were sure of the possibility of the use of the German method of research in America, and whether they sympathized or not, Boards of Trustees under the leadership too frequently of ambitious administrators soon converted American colleges into budding and sometimes blooming universities. This was always with the central and major emphasis being placed upon the College of Letters and Science, with a larger or smaller group of more or less vocationally motivated professional schools clustering about the so-called College of Liberal Arts.

This change in nomenclature from colleges to universities did not aid in clarifying the use of terms either at home or abroad; for nowhere else on earth is there an institution similar to the American college; and the American university, where it truly exists, combines some, but not all, of the features of both the English and the German ideas,— enough of each to disconcert both English and German critics.

The tendency toward secularization naturally fostered the growth of the American university idea. For the ambitious programs of the new university leaders could best be carried out by having the tax resources of great states at their command. In the laws making possible state universities through federal aid in land grants, agriculture was guaranteed aid in the necessity of providing for agricultural courses and, where advisable, even Agricultural Colleges. The financial and numerical development of these great institutions has been marvelous, and the most outstanding glory of them, as well as the principal basis for their criticism, is the fact that they have failed either to carry out the discipline and culture of their progenitors or to produce a discipline sufficiently challenging to warrant the enormous expenditure of time and of effort which has gone into their making. However, their comparative youth and the "brand new" character of their attempt, as well as the rawness of the surrounding lands and peoples should be taken into account. They yet lack many years of being a century old. Will any of their critics show such achievement and such product in a similar period of time anywhere else?

The Germanizing of the schools was possible in America, it is true, for two reasons,— America always has welcomed applied science, if not pure science,— and,— the substitution of the discipline of the laboratory for the discipline of the textbook.

As concerns the first of these, it must be said that if, as some would hold, America is not science-minded, she at least has always welcomed the products of science, and the development of the engineer — sanitary, civil, electrical, mining, mechanical, social, what have you? — has not only been welcomed in America, but has also been grudgingly admired in Europe, although his product, alas, is always material and mechanical, even though based on the discoveries of the pure scientist! And poor, unsophisticated, unenlightened, uncultured, backwoods America with the highest paid workers and with the highest standard of living and the most sanitary architecture and the most respect for the achievements of applied science, goes on growing richer and richer and more and more comfortable as the result of research, and does not hesitate to throw fabulous sums into the coffers of the American universities and still more fabulous sums into the building of dormitories, libraries, and laboratories, until there are now listed by the Commissioner of Education, more than seven hundred colleges and universities of various foundations.

Then, again, the secularizing of secondary education, throwing an unprecedented number of high school trained students into our colleges, made the growth of an elective system much better adapted to the scientific than to the cultural method. The main effect of this process upon organization was the danger it proved to be to the old-fashioned American college. It has been squeezed by the senior high school and the junior college from beneath, and by the university from above, until, in the minds of many, it despairs of life. However, scattered over America to-day are literally scores of small colleges, more or less adequately endowed or otherwise financed, which still serve, and serve so well that their future seems more promising than were even the glories of the past. One has only to recall Dartmouth, Amherst, Wesleyan, Swarthmore, De Pauw, Carleton, Haverford, Knox, and others, to understand that the day of the small college is not past. And Harvard's recent decision to cut up her large student body into small sections, not merely for residence and social reasons, but for academic purposes as well is a sure indication of the growing appreciation of the values of the smaller units in the system. There are, in fact, large numbers of serious-minded educators who honestly believe that the cultural life of America will be determined more largely by our small colleges than by our universities. But, if this is to remain true, our colleges must remain both centers of culture and preparatory institutions for the research work of our great universities.

In our discussion of the second effect of the Germanizing of our schools, namely the loss of the discipline of the textbook and the substitution therefor of the discipline of the laboratory, the gains would seem to outweigh the losses. Accuracy of reading and of reproduction of texts, possibilities of cultural absorptions, and the enrichment of the mind with the inspiring ideas of antiquity, the filling of the mind with apt quotations from standard classical authors, and the general appreciation of the humanities, were all to a greater or less degree values so appreciated and so developed. The teachers under such a system were not so much characterized by their abilities as scholars and research men as by their abilities to stimulate a passion for the learning of ideas and of attitudes, and for the storing of the minds of the students with long quotations from classical and more modern authors. In short, the whole system designed to reproduce British culture by the very necessities of the case very largely became a matter of memory training and of storing. As a basis for a national culture it was very poor, but it at least kept the lamp of learning burning and it certainly produced a type of leadership which helped to make the America of to-day.

The influence of the study of the German language and literature was more decided than would appear to the casual observer or to the statistician. From a study of American catalogue offerings it becomes evident that the classical languages are receding in their hold upon student interest, and, as the modern languages were substituted, the appeal of the German, natural and stimulated, was very great. For instance, just before the war, in California 98 per cent of the secondary schools were teaching the German language and literature. Scientific works were most frequently published in German, and German scientific journals had a real vogue. In the cultural fields of philosophy and of pure literature also the German influence upon American scholarship and culture was very marked.

The war changed all of this. The Rhodes Scholarship awards have had their bases changed time and again in the interest of a more liberal interpretation of the terms of the scholarships themselves and also in the modification of the means of entrance into Oxford. And the eclipse of the German star during the war, with the engendered hatreds added to the serious handicaps suffered by the universities in the loss of personnel as well as by the great financial losses incident to the struggle, made the German influence noticeably less.

The phenomenal rise in general and per capita American wealth, first noticeable about the beginning of the second decade of the twentieth century, was very greatly accelerated during, and doubtless by, the world war. America, coming from a long experience as a debtor nation, suddenly found herself not only a creditor nation but *the* creditor nation. Creditors are never popular, and impersonal creditors such as corporations and nations are less so. It became the fashion to criticize America. It did and does not matter on which side of the water the criticism arises,—it is vocalized and published. The criticisms are usually grouped as follows: America is machine-minded and not science-minded; America is materialistic and not spiritual; America may be trained but never cultured; America may be rich but never refined; America may have great schools, but little real scholarship.

Unfortunately many of these strictures are true. And many *Americans* are quite ready to confess their truth. But *European* critics fail to note two very important factors in the evolution of American life: First, her people nearly all came from Europe, and those who came were not the most backward ones either: and secondly, in an incredibly short space of time at least the material standards of living have been elevated to an unprecedented height and, so far as human bodies having burdens to bear, there is to be found nowhere else such freedom from toil, disease, or physical distress as in America. Are not these achievements in themselves spiritual, or are they not at least spiritually effective?

Moreover, the machine production of America leads to the abolition of hard physical labor, and statistics show a tremendous increase in professional and personal service in America.

Judged by the standards of a thousand years of accumulation, America's accumulation of the evidences in the plastic, musical, and literary arts may be small, but why not apply the test of say a hundred years?

It is a source of considerable pleasure to a real American that this release from toil and struggle, and this increase in income, is being used by unprecedented numbers of people in educational attempts at least. Comparisons of the proportionate numbers of students in higher institutions are ludicrous; and certainly with each year the physical accretions to our American university plants, equipments, and endowments are becoming more staggering to the imagination. One is tempted to wonder what would happen to staid old Oxford if it should be confronted with ten thousand students instead of three or four thousand; and one wonders if the antiquated dormitories would be duplicated if some American millionaire would offer to build new and up-to-date, safe, and sanitary structures, like some of America's university dormitories. One might wish that the offer might be made in order to see if the scorn registered over our care for the materialities of our universities would be registered over such an offer.

If there are several attempts in America to imitate the English method of academic training, one does not, at any rate, discover any slavish attempts to reproduce the physical aspects and interior arrangements of the schools beyond the seas.

Perhaps a clearer understanding of the objectives of education judged, as far as possible, from a national standpoint would clarify the situation. Europe has two and only two criteria for education,— culture, and scholarship through research. The general diffusion of wealth is not so great there, and class distinctions, particularly in France and Germany, almost preclude general college attendance as it is found in the United States. The pyramid of the American school enrollment is most interesting: twenty-three million in the elementary schools, four million in the secondary schools, and more than one million in colleges and universities. When education is confronted by such numbers — so suddenly thrust upon it — it is bound to stagger.

The simple fact of the case is, the average American college seems to be a combination of a Country Club, a Forum, and a Cloister, as well as an educational institution in the approved European style. America is new, raw, elemental, crude, unrefined. But, thank God, she knows it, and, knowing it, sends from city and country, from industrial plant and from farm, boys and girls by the thousands who learn how to live together for four years, and then how to work together for a new world. They seem boisterous and rude, ill-mannered and selfish, raw and callow, but their foolishness and crudity are much more apparent in September than in June, as freshmen than as seniors. They need, and most of them get, what the most polished week-ender in England seeks and finds.

Unfortunately, the Oxford Union is not copied extensively here. Fortunately or unfortunately, it depends upon the viewpoint: our students are not radicals; they seldom rebel, as students have done and still do in Europe; and most unfortunately the average university lecturer is so sure of his facts and of his interpretation of them that there is little chance for classroom discussion. In fact, the discipline of the lecture plan is really quite deadening! But only the uninformed will fail to see the great value of college discussions, not in the formal debates, but here and there and particularly in the so-called "bull sessions." The American student learns to think and to speak his mind in the fields of his interest. These interests may not be those of his European cousin, and certainly they are not those of his Asiatic relatives, but they are interests that his fellow-beings must consider sooner or later.

Where is the cloister? Read college poetry, read college periodicals, study the statistics of the sacrificial professions, learn the story of altruism, find the source of our political idealism. There can be no question, the cloister is there.

If the American educational ideal were limited to scholarship through research, only the Phi Beta Kappa average would be in attendance in universities. With all of the accessories and material aids provided, and with no problems of discipline to deflect from the main objective, American educational productivity might be as possessive and as hypercritical as that which levels its guns upon our mediocrity.

Yes, America, you have undertaken a hitherto undreamed of task. You have attempted not only to provide an education for those who desire it, but in many states you have made it obligatory upon all through the adolescent period. You have not only provided a few cultural centers, but you are richly providing for every need of all classes of learners, and the response is terrifying in number and in demand; but it is infinitely better to try for all, than to smother the desires and ambitions of multitudes, even though your finished product in the average does not correspond to Europe's ideal, for after all, America, you have to be responsible for a new America, not for a new Europe.

PART TWO

AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF EUROPEAN TRADITIONS

3

Sir John Adams

INTEGRALISM

3

INTEGRALISM

Sir John Adams

PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON, ENGLAND,
AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

> *"Integral education is . . . the methodical development of all the powers or faculties of the human soul by means of the universality of the sciences, classified and arranged in a hierarchy in view of their didactic use."*
>
> A. BERTRAND IN L'ENSEIGNEMENT INTÉGRAL

THE information fallacy has always had a malign influence on what we to-day regard as true education. There is a very natural tendency among human beings to regard education as the communication of knowledge. It gets inextricably mixed up with teaching, and teaching is regarded, not altogether erroneously, as consisting essentially of imparting knowledge in some form or other. As we go to a fishmonger's for plaice, to a cheesemonger's for roquefort and to an ironmonger's for nails, so we naturally go to school for knowledge. In the eyes of the general public the schoolmaster figures as an information-monger, and the school as a knowledge-store.

The plain man cannot be expected to analyze out the real meaning of education, and to realize that knowledge is only the instrument used by the educator to attain his purpose. What that purpose ultimately is God alone knows, for in the age-long controversy on this subject no final conclusion has yet been reached. But there is a growing agreement that whatever else may be included in the goal of education one at least of its fundamental aims is to enable the individual to make himself at home in his environment, to behave intelligently and wisely in the state to which he has been called. To this end the communication of knowledge is obviously essential: so it is not surprising that knowledge subtends such a big angle in the minds of all those concerned with education. Certainly critics are not lacking to point out that mere knowledge is not enough. We feel that John Ruskin is justified when he says that the purpose of education is not to make people know what they did not know before, but to behave as they did not behave before. Yet in order to produce this improvement in behavior the educator finds the communication of knowledge a valuable instrument.

In the old days knowledge was a much more manageable tool than it is to-day. Time was when a philosopher could, without rousing the scornful laughter of his contemporaries, take all knowledge as his province. Pansophy was not then a joke. In the fifth century A.D. Martianus Capella could write a short play embodying all the knowledge then recognized as such. Even when the seventh century demanded more accommodation for the store of available knowledge Archbishop Isidore of Seville could compress it all into twenty brief books, which in their turn can be put into a couple of columns of our modern type, as an Oxford don has demonstrated. But while these old encyclopedists — Boethius, Cassiodorus and the rest — were concerned with the best presentation of the accumulated knowledge of their times, they did not greatly trouble themselves about classifying and collating the facts they set down. Their business was merely to make as complete a collection of facts as possible. To us of to-day they have passed on the problem of organizing the vast body of acquired knowledge in such a way as to make the best use of it as an educational organon.

To be sure the modern educational curriculum is shadowed forth in the old Trivium and Quadrivium making up the seven liberal arts, which lasted long enough to determine the university course under which I was myself educated. But of late years the world has become alive to the need for a more or less scientific organization of knowledge as the instrument of education. This problem has now come into the arena of practical educational politics.

Perhaps nowhere in the world is there such urgent need for reform in this matter as in the United States. For convenience let us adopt the somewhat pedantic term that De Quincey used to describe the matter to be taught. The word *curriculum* indicates the whole school course in its various aspects, but *docendum* is limited to the subject to be taught. In the U. S. A. schools there is greater freedom in the choice of subjects than in any other civilized country. It has been said that there the docendum is served *à la carte,* whereas in most other countries it is served *table d'hôte*. Very few subjects are compulsory, and not many are brought under a regulation that demands the continuation of the study over a series of sessions. The result is a rather scattered educational bill of fare. The pupil carries on in what may be called the "tire lire" system from the name of the French child's bank — one of those tin affairs into which pennies can be thrust with ease, but from which it is difficult to extract them. The pupil fills in credit after credit during his course at school, drops them into the scholastic "tire lire" and at the end draws them all out and presents them so as to secure a final general credit that admits him to the university, or supplies a guarantee of fitness for entrance on what is called real life. The university carries on the same plan and the student builds up his degree on a sort of mosaic system by which credit is added to credit till by and by the pattern is complete and the student has qualified for the sheepskin.

There is a general impression abroad in the United States that all is not well as a result of this *tire lire* or *mosaic* scheme. But curiously enough it is not on this side of the Atlantic that anxiety has developed most with regard to the confused state of mind that must result from this free and easy choice of subjects. Or perhaps it is not so curious after all, for it is only natural that the tidy-minded French should be among the first to be disturbed by a system that results in a "thing of shreds and patches." To be sure the French system is at the opposite pole from the American in the matter of freedom of choice in the docendum. Truth to tell, the French pupil is emphatically brought up under the *table d'hôte* plan. If then in spite of rigid limitation of choice the French educators feel the result to be patchy, we may have to find something else than over freedom of choice as cause of the American scrappiness. For our enlightenment let us look at the French case as it presents itself to Frenchmen.

A clear demand has arisen over there for an education that shall be something more than mere instruction. The adjective they use to qualify what they want is *integral*. They desire an education that shall be a whole, an organized unity, and not a series of unconnected processes. We are familiar in America with the distinction between mere teaching and education, but the French term *enseignement*, used as the substantive with *integral*, might be confounded with *instruction*, so it will be well to quote its exact meaning as used by Professeur Alexis Bertrand. On p. 19 of his book *L'Enseignement Intégral* we read:

> In the word "Enseignement" instruction and education are both included: *enseigner* is not to arrange or set forth [*dresser*], it is to educate [*elever*], it is to mould a spirit, and not to manipulate a machine so that it may learn and retain.

Here we have a recognition and rejection of the information fallacy. The distinction is clearly made between the two aspects of education, the training and the informal. The mere teacher is separated from the complete educator. Of the two terms *educator* is the wider. It may be said that we can educate without actual teaching. We may so arrange matters as to produce on another the effects we desire, without going through any process that may be correctly called teaching. On the other hand we cannot teach without at the same time educating. Every time we communicate knowledge we cause some change, however slight, in the person to whom we have imparted it: in other words we educate him. It is true that this form is sometimes denied recognition, since the term education is rightly held to include in its connotation the element of deliberate purpose. The kind of education that arises from the unintentional, or even unwitting, communication of knowledge will naturally come under that type known as by-education. But under whatever name the communication of knowledge may be described its result is educational, and what is at present disturbing French educationists is the unorganized state of the process that includes both knowledge-giving and disposition-guiding.

For the sake of clearness let us define education, provisionally at any rate, as the directing of the development of the pupil by the deliberate use of an instrument, that instrument being generally accepted as knowledge. We deliberately communicate knowledge with the express purpose of guiding the development of the person to be educated. The last phrase is introduced to avoid the use of the term *pupil,* because this term is in ordinary usage restricted to the person who is instructed or taught. *Pupil* is the natural correlate of *teacher.* In ordinary English speech *pupil* has to do twofold duty: it is the primary correlate to *teacher,* but it is sometimes called upon "a double debt to pay" and to play correlate also to the word *educator.* To mark the distinction between mere teaching and the wider process of education, it is well to have a definitive correlate of *educator.* This may be discovered in the word *educand* that we find in Sir William Petty's *Advice* that appeared in 1648. At that time there was a need for the word, because the underlying meanings of education were being discussed. But the mere journeyman teachers of that time had no use for such nice distinctions: at any rate the word did not secure a permanent place in our vocabulary. *Educand* was what lexicographers call a "nonce word": that is, a word used for the nonce by a writer to meet a temporary need.

One would have thought that the French, with their keen desire for accurate expression, would have felt the need of filling the gap. But they have left the aching void, though they have recognized it as such, and have set themselves to reorganize the whole situation, so as to bring the shreds and patches into some sort of unity.

When the French took to serious consideration of Education as a study they found that there was great confusion regarding the results of the current national education. In particular they were concerned about the way in which the young people were divided into two bands, one fed on the classics and languages, the other on science and mathematics. This bifurcation is a direct breach of the principle of Integralism. But the difference is still based on the docendum, not on the nature of the educand. Whatever may be thought about the way of making a suitable selection of subject matter, some sort of selection must be made. We are long past the stage at which we can take the pansophic attitude: so we must look for unification elsewhere than in the docendum. The natural plan is to pass from the subjects to be studied to the mind that is to study them. This mind will be found to be in the last resort the one reliable unifying force. If the diverse subjects are to be reduced to a rational whole the directing and organizing influence is to be sought for in the mind of the educand. Descartes himself in his treatment of the problem does not seem to be so clear on this point as we should like him to be. In his *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* he tells us:

> We must be persuaded that all the sciences are so closely correlated that it is more easy to learn them all at the same time than to detach one of them from the other. If, then, one wishes to seek the truth seriously, one must not apply oneself to one science alone: they are all bound together and mutually depend on one another.

Here it would appear that the unification is found ready-made in the docendum, and that all the mind has to do is to seek out a unity that is already there to be discovered, the work of discovery being left to the mind. The unity of the universe is to be discovered by each individual for himself, for the obvious reason that each individual must in the last resort have a universe of his own, beyond which he cannot pass, and within which he must be at home. Internal harmony is of the very essence of spiritual health. All the complexes and phobias that make up the working capital of the psychoanalyst are merely different manifestations of the lack of this internal harmony. In the ultimate resort the aim of education might not inaptly be described as the establishment and maintenance of internal harmony.

The French educationists in feeling after this internal harmony encounter confusion and discord throughout the whole experience of the ordinary educand, even as he is found in their fine lycées. Everything looks hopeful at the beginning of the inquiry. The schools are excellent, the teachers are of high quality and are extremely well-trained, at any rate in the matter of intellectual equipment. The buildings are not all that could be desired, no doubt, and there is a certain rigidity in administration that is far from reassuring. But the curriculum and schemes of work are scientifically drawn up, and the textbooks are the work of competent experts, certainly suggesting a school system marked by striking thoroughness. Yet when the investigator comes to look into the results as tested by the mental content of the pupils after the course is completed, he regretfully admits that of all the scientific and literary matter included in the curriculum the pupil, even when intelligent and industrious, retains at the end of his school course only a very small residue, and that made up mainly of disparate elements. On the language side there is usually a more satisfactory rump than on the scientific, since the linguistic residues take the form of skill rather than of mere knowledge. On the scientific side the residue is valuable in direct proportion to the degree in which it takes the form of application rather than of the mere attainment of knowledge.

The confusion of thought about the whole matter is illustrated by the sort of counsel of despair that M. Prévost issues in the end, when he suggests that the best plan might be to find out by experimental investigation the amount of knowledge left in the typical pupil's mind at the end of his course at the lycée, and to limit the pupils' attention to that. The suggestion appears to be that at the end of the school stage the pupil should have an intensive period of study during which he would acquire in a few months all that his harassed predecessors had spent seven years in acquiring. Nothing is said of what use is to be made of the six and a half years saved. Is the pupil to lie fallow during these years? It is a knotty problem, but one that does not concern us here, for the integralists as a body are not likely to take up the pessimistic attitude of Prévost.

The less pessimistic integralists approach the matter in a different but sufficiently dispiriting way. Their complaint is that the educands have no sort of general idea of what the whole educational scheme means. They do not know what it is all about. They do their day's darg honestly enough, week in, week out, but do not trouble themselves to inquire whither it is all tending. "What is it all about?" is the title of an address delivered, a score of years ago, by the President of a great state university in America, and his hearers went away with a very hazy idea of what ought to be the answer. For the President, after saying a great many disagreeable things about education as it was then conducted, left his audience in the position of the modern French *lycien,* with the difference that the audience wanted to know the answer, and the school boy does not.

In a remarkable essay on *An Education that Failed,* the late Ernest Lavisse, then Rector of *L'École Normale Supérieure* of Paris, points out that the *lycien* has no thought of what the whole thing is about. He comes to school each morning and takes this subject and that at the hands of various specialists, who are experts at their job but produce no effect on the pupil beyond communicating to him a certain modicum of knowledge. "It is a case," says Lavisse, "of a fragment of an educator addressing itself to a fragment of a pupil," and, he might well have added — about a fragment of a subject.

He goes on to say that the pupil is not really to blame for not knowing the ultimate object of all this education, and the aims of the masters, for these latter do not themselves know. They come regularly to the *Lycée* and do their daily work. Their interest — and that interest is keen — lies in the subjects they teach rather than in the pupils. They forget that as their own syntax books precisely proclaim: "Verbs of teaching have two accusatives, one of the person the other of the thing; as, *The master teaches Louis Latin.*" One accusative contents most masters. Their interest centers in Latin, not in Louis.

Lavisse is in despair: but he does make a suggestion, though in a rather hopeless fashion. His own words may be rendered thus:

> We shall be educators the day on which, each of us having before the mind the whole successive development of the pupil, we shall be all and each so to speak the same master, the perpetual master of that pupil.

The practical schoolmaster has no difficulty in sharing the hopelessness of the writer of these lines. The suggestion really is that the faculty of a school shall resolve itself into a collective unit, so that it may apply itself to each individual pupil in the school. The thing is preposterous — hardly seems to admit of serious consideration.

Yet a certain approach to something of this kind has been made in recent years in some secondary schools, though the unit has not been the boy but the docendum. The members of the school faculty sometimes organize themselves according to the subjects they teach, and form coöperating groups for dealing with their docendum. Centers of such groups are found in Mathematics, Classics, Modern Languages, History, Geography, and, in particular, English. The organization sometimes extends further and results in combinations of similar groups. Thus a combine may be made to include all subjects dealing with foreign languages, another to include those dealing with mathematics and physics, a third those dealing with geography, history and economics, a fourth including those dealing with physical training and hygiene in all its forms. Out of this pooling based upon the docendum there may arise, in some cases already does arise, a tendency to a pooling of interests in the pupils. In the process of comparing notes about the best ways of presenting subject matter, the teachers may be led to distribute their attention over the school field in such a way as to bring their pupils into greater prominence as human beings. Louis may be kept in the same continuum as Latin, and thus a big stride made toward Integralism.

Naturally the competition between pupil and docendum, between Louis and Latin, has not passed entirely unnoticed, and it is encouraging for Americans to discover that the first overt recognition of the trouble is to be found in a term invented by one of the most original of their own educational writers. To be sure the term itself has many faults: it is a neologism formidable, pedantic, hybrid. It has almost all the bad qualities a word can have — but it has the great compensation of being very suggestive and useful. G. Stanley Hall deserved well of our craft when he coined the intimidating *Paidocentricism*, for by the very act he proclaimed the awakening of himself and his fellows to the need for the distinction the term implies. It was the lack of the thing — *the centering of* *the teacher's attention on the pupil* — that stimulated G. S. H. to the invention of the word. The natural tendency of secondary teachers is to take pride in their subjects at the expense of their pupils. It is easier to be proud of Latin than of Louis. *Materiocentricism* is more attractive to teachers than paidocentricism: it is easier to center interest in the docendum than in the pupil. After all, Latin is a much simpler matter to study than is Louis.

It will be noted that emphasis has been laid on the fact that we are here dealing with secondary teachers. In the elementary school there is not the same temptation to raise the docendum to an unwholesome eminence: there is not much glory to be won from association with the three R's. We gain little appreciation from spelling correctly, though we suffer social eclipse if we spell badly. It is when we get into the secondary environment that we begin to think of our academic attainments more highly than we ought to think.

At the elementary stage the docendum is simple enough to be kept in the hands of one person, or at the most of two or three. It is when specialism creeps in that trouble arises. In the past the elementary teacher has been treated as the complete master of his class and of the various subjects he brings before them. He knows his subjects sufficiently well to teach them all successfully. He is so long and so intimately associated with his pupils every day that he knows them thoroughly as human beings. He thinks at least as much about his pupils as he does about the simple matters that he has to present to them. It is accordingly quite feasible for him to adopt the integralist attitude. Indeed, it is inevitable. He can get at each pupil and present the docendum in such a way as to meet each individual's needs. It has to be admitted that the number of pupils in an elementary class is often so great that from this cause alone the teacher can only inefficiently apply the integralist principle. But here we have to deal with only a matter of degree. So long as the numbers in elementary classes can be kept down to forty, there is nothing to hinder a capable teacher from applying effectively the methods demanded by the integralists.

It is when specialization arrives that trouble begins. When a class has a change of teacher for each subject in the course of a school day, it is impossible for every teacher to get into sufficiently close touch with the pupils to come anywhere near the integralist standard. We have a conflict between two ideals — skill in teaching a special subject, and skill in training individual pupils. The struggle between Louis and Latin becomes acute: but the problem involved is not insoluble. There are, indeed, several solutions. What we have to determine is which, if any, is practicable.

The most obvious way of meeting the situation is also the least palatable to the practical teachers: so much so, indeed, that it has almost never been seriously discussed in America as a practical proposition. To put it in the form that at once secures its rejection by the average secondary teacher it may be described as the plan of definitely carrying on the elementary school practice and making the class-teacher undertake instruction in all the subjects of the course. At once the disagreeable symptoms of materiocentricism show themselves: the pride in the docendum is inflamed. It is hotly claimed that no one person can by any possibility know all the subjects of a secondary course sufficiently well to teach them satisfactorily. There is the suggestion that the proposed scheme would demand a race of Admirable Crichtons to secure success. Now, while it may be frankly admitted at once that the docendum might suffer just a little from the lack of special knowledge-attainment involved in the proposed plan, it is worth at least considering whether the technical loss involved may not be more than compensated by the gain to the pupil through increased effective contact with the teacher. Our aim is to make education a unified process in which pupil and docendum are to be brought into the most wholesome relation with one another. Is it not possible that the teacher-personality may prove to be of more importance than his mere skillful application of the docendum?

Opposition to this scheme here takes two forms. The first objection is that the pupils may get too much of the teacher personality, even when that is of the best quality. Variety in education has a virtue of its own. As it takes all sorts of people to make a world, so it takes all sorts of personalities to form the most wholesome social environment in which the pupil may be brought up. In their eagerness to get rid of this Admirable-Crichton demand made upon them, teachers in their discussions sometimes go the length of suggesting that a certain admixture of the less desirable qualities may not be altogether a disadvantage when we are dealing with a collective unity such as the faculty of a school. Carried to excess this suggestion leads to the second objection, which is that few teachers are sufficiently fine in character to be set up as the sole model on which pupil-character should be formed.

The scheme we have been considering may be conveniently named Regenting, since it was actually applied under that name in the history of certain of the old universities. In these cases at the beginning of the session the students who turned up were allocated to whichever of the professors were free at the time, and each of these took full charge of his flock in all the subjects of the curriculum, taking the students through the full three or four years of the course and teaching them all the subjects. This would seem to cut away the current objection that no one teacher can be sufficiently master of all the subjects of a secondary course. It would appear that if one man could undertake all the subjects of a university curriculum a teacher need not despair of mastering all the subjects of a school. But we have no very strong evidence that the old regenting system was satisfactory, and in addition we must not forget that knowledge has extended somewhat since those old university days.

But before altogether dismissing this unpopular regenting scheme it may be useful to bring forward a workable plan that really meets the needs of the case, though unfortunately on a limited scale. To introduce this solution at the present stage will have the double advantage of cheering us a little after the dispiriting criticism we have just dealt with, and of preparing the way for a form of the regenting system that is at any rate less repellent.

In the English housemaster we have a workable solution of the integralist problem. He is the real mediator between Louis and Latin. He is himself a teacher but is at the same time the head of a house in which are boarded a number of pupils varying from a score to forty or even more. To them he stands in the fullest sense *in loco parentis*. Indeed it is getting customary among English teachers to call housemasters *foster parents*. They usually have a specialty which they teach so they do not underestimate the docendum, yet their wholesome relation to their boys as human beings produces a happy reconciliation of the claims of materiocentricism and paidocentricism. By all the circumstances of the case the housemaster is almost forced to adopt a broad attitude towards the two opposing forces. So far as an outside influence can modify what goes on in the experience of another, he is in an ideal position to develop a unified state of mind among his pupils. Boys living in a "house" are subject to all the ordinary school influences with regard to the docendum, and with most of the home influences that result from living in a family. The limitation implied in the phrase "most of" indicates not merely a lack but also an advantage. In the school "house" the weaker sides of parental control are eliminated, and the proper attitude towards the docendum is attained. Were it possible to secure that all young people should be sent to schools where they would live with a housemaster, the problem of integralism might be said to be practically solved. It is true that the degree of success would depend on the kind of housemaster available. But that consideration does not affect us here. Our part of the work is done if we can suggest a solution that is practicable in view of the conditions of the case.

Since the solution we have found is strictly limited as to scope, and since we must search for a wider range, we are compelled again to edge our way back to the class-teacher in a day school, the typical national teacher of America. Truth to tell he will probably not welcome our approach; that regenting plan has ruffled his feathers. His equivalent, the form-master, in England gives us no more cordial welcome, though he is actually carrying out the integral ideal with some success. In point of fact he rather likes the ideal, but he hates talking about it. The American class-teacher has not yet begun even to think about it, but when it is brought before his notice he is just the person to give the idea careful and favorable consideration. He may be relied upon to talk quite freely about it, and to do his best to bring out all its possibilities.

These possibilities may be gathered from the answer an English formmaster gave when asked what his special subject was in his school: "Well, I specialize in mathematics, and in fourth form boys." This indicated that while he specialized in mathematics he also had charge of the fourth form in his school thus representing a compromise that in England, the land of Compromise, is seeking to combine the advantages of the form system and the specialist system. The advantages of specialism, particularly in the higher grades in school, cannot be denied, so no headmaster can afford to let a brilliant mathematician or historian or modern language man waste his departmentalized knowledge on the mere general work of a form. (Every American teacher now knows that *form* means a class in an English Secondary School.) Accordingly, the teacher is set to work to deal with his specialty in whatever parts of the school it is most required. But at the same time the headmaster may be unwilling to lose the advantage of whatever knowledge of boy nature at a given stage has been acquired by this teacher while at his junior stages he was master of a form. So it sometimes comes about that while the Principal gradually sets apart a formmaster for more and more special work throughout his school, he retains him still as the official head of his form, even though by and by the amount of time this "drafted" teacher can give to his form is so small that he can teach it only one subject. Indeed it not infrequently happens that such a teacher finally reaches a stage at which he does not teach at all in the form of which he remains the titular head. He is a specialist so far as his docendum is concerned. But he retains his formmastership because in this connection he is dealing with boys as boys. He is responsible for the general conduct and well-being of this form: if anything goes wrong with the form, or with any member of it, the appeal is to him. He stands to this form *in loco parentis,* he is its foster parent.

The development of this peculiar status of the formmaster is still rudimentary, but the lines along which it is likely to move are clear. The form will become a sort of vague collective unit dominated by the master who is its real head, though he does not do much, or any, teaching of its members.

This misty form in fact corresponds to a somewhat less misty "House" that day schools in England have originated to obtain some of the good results that they see to flow from the organization under housemasters. Though there are no real houses and therefore no boarders to make up an artificial family, the heads of day schools sometimes set up artificial houses into which they divide the pupils of the whole school. These organized groups of pupils have official heads and officers, and cultivate assiduously a sort of corporate personality. They have house-names, house-colors, house-mottoes and house-watchwords. The movement — as yet more popular in girls' schools than in boys'— is distinctly an asset to Integralism, and suggests lines of development that are worth study.

In America the problem is being handled in various ways, without, of course, involving the use of the term *integralism*, for the approach is, as was to be expected, practical rather than theoretical. The truth is that in America the problem of integralism is being solved unwittingly in those two hundred thousand single-teacher schools where the disadvantages of the situation are to some extent compensated by the necessity of making each individual pupil a unity within which disparate forces are worked up into a more or less harmonious whole. It is when the schools grow large and have to accept a somewhat severe organization that the integralist ideal is in danger. That the Americans are alive to this danger is proved by certain devices they have adopted. Among these is what is called the "Home Room," where an experienced teacher holds her Court and is open to consult with pupils in all manner of difficulties that arise in connection with their school work, whether these difficulties are concerned with the docendum or with the social side of school life. Devices of this kind imply a realization of the problem of integralism, but a great many of the modern school developments have a direct bearing upon it without any deliberate intention of dealing with the problem as such. In the working of the Gary Plan, for example, it was found that individualism in the Departmental System led to an undue emphasis on the docendum at the expense of the personality of the pupils. Accordingly, a scheme of teacher-advisers was established. Specially capable teachers, who from their familiarity with school organization and their knowledge of junior human nature were in a position to mediate successfully between the claims of personality and the docendum, were appointed as a sort of teacher-deans. These will probably find a definite place in the development of the American scheme of education, though in the meantime the experience of Gary would seem to point to the difficulties rather than to the success of the scheme.

The Dalton Plan gives a pointer in the same direction. At first sight it would appear that this innovation should tend to distraction rather than to unification. But though the pupils under it are thrown more and more upon their own initiative, the scheme demands a harmonizing of the school work as a whole, the establishment of a system within which individuals work out their own salvation.

But what shall we say of another and very popular American movement? Is not the Project Plan working directly against Integralism? No doubt there is a certain unification within each of the Projects undertaken: all the matters within the realm of operations must be so correlated as to form an organized whole. So far we are entitled to claim the integralist's blessing. But when we take the wide view of education as a whole we find him shaking his head. Taken in relation to one another these well organized project units are found to be themselves shreds and patches which appear to defy any scheme of general unification of the School System. And yet the avowed purpose of the plan is to effect a reconciliation between two opposing influences, theory and practice. It is because our education is charged with being too theoretical and over-systematized that reformers have come along with this offer of an outlet in which there may be found a means of coordinating the two claims by satisfying them both.

It is interesting to note that Russia has cast a favorable eye on the American experiment. To be sure she believes that in this, as in so many other directions, the westerners do not go far enough. It is charged that they are only playing at the Project Plan, while Russia with its equivalent, called the *Com-*

plex System, reaches cold reality. But both in Russia and in the United States the plan as it stands necessarily fails from the standpoint of Integralism. In a wider and fuller development there is no doubt that a broad unifying principle could be discovered. If we could view matters from the Spinozian angle *sub specie æternitatis*, there would be little difficulty. But with our present limited range we have far to go yet before we can claim the Project Plan as a step in the direction of Integralism. On the other hand, the realization of the loss of systematization involved in the full application of the Project Plan is an added spur to our efforts to secure unification.

So far we have regarded the docendum as in some sense the enemy. It has appeared all along the line as a stumbling block, a rock of offense. But among the subjects to be taught there is one that offers certain advantages to the Integralists. In a curious way the subject of English has more or less unwittingly been forced into a position of opposition to all the other subjects of the curriculum. The cause of this may be found in the peculiar position of the mother tongue. It is not a "subject" in the ordinary sense of that term. No doubt there is a body of Literature in English that forms an admirable subject of study, but back of this the mother tongue itself occupies a unique position, and enters into the domain of all the other subjects of the curriculum.

In the Report of an English Departmental Committee on the teaching of English there occurs a remark of first rate importance. The author of this remark deserves well of his fellow craftsmen. It runs: "Every teacher *in* English is a teacher *of* English." Here we have a world-wide integralist principle: for we have no monopoly in it. *Mother tongue* may be substituted for English without in any way vitiating the sense.

On the side of the docendum the integralist must do his best to organize the various subjects in such a way as to correlate them as parts of an organic whole. In this work obviously the mother tongue will form an invaluable aid. It possesses what may be called ambassadorial privileges in relation to the other subjects. There has been up till now a sort of sporadic warfare going on between the teachers of the mother tongue and the teachers of all the other subjects who have as a matter of fact sought to turn the mother-tongue teachers into a sort of Gibeonites. These unfortunates, you will remember from your Bible, were turned into hewers of wood and drawers of water. The other specialist teachers every now and again try to turn into educational Gibeonites the mother-tongue teachers by getting them to do the correction of all written exercises. Their true function, however, is to mediate among the various subjects, and in this way do an excellent turn for Integralism.

Up till now it is probable that teacher readers of these pages have followed in more or less reluctant agreement this exposition of the problem of Integralism as it is overtly proclaimed in France, and implicitly involved in the educational schemes of the English-speaking peoples. There has been enough of the concrete and practical to permit of frank discussion on what may be called a common-sense basis. But now, having placated the practical person, we may perhaps be permitted to look at matters in a rather more theoretical way. Hitherto we have treated the educand as a more or less passive element in the problem, a sort of pawn in the hands of the educator. We knew all the time, of course, that he was nothing of the kind, and that his reactions are of the first importance in the working out of our problem. Now, we must bring him into the limelight where he properly belongs: for after all he is the only center from which the desired unification may be effected.

The trouble is that the experience of each individual, the only sphere in which personality and the docendum can be unified, is a strictly private region, with "Trespassers forbidden" notices erected all over the place. In point of fact the notices are needless, since we cannot enter the forbidden area even if we tried. Taking the pupil ego as the personality with which we are at present concerned, we can only wander around the boundaries of the forbidden area, and guess what is going on within. We cannot be accused of impertinence or idle curiosity. If the warning notices read after the English fashion: "No admittance, except on business," we can go boldly forward and claim admission as of right. For we certainly have business, important business, within. But no such concession is suggested. The notice takes the uncompromising form used in America: "Keep out."

Though we cannot enter we can make an excellent guess at what is going on within. We have a sort of key to the mysteries inside supplied by our own experience. By a process of analogy we infer that what goes on within our own experience will go on in the experience of others. So we make our arrangements accordingly.

The whole problem must be faced in connection with the existence of two worlds that are commonly called inner and outer. We all think we understand at least the outer world. It is there before us lying open to inspection. It belongs to all of us. We have equal rights in thinking about it. But when we come to the inner world, all our confidence disappears. We have each an inner world of our own into which we do not, and indeed cannot, admit others. If we want to get into touch with our fellows the thing must be done outside of this inner world of us and of them. The natural meeting place is this outer world in which we all feel at home. But when we look further into the matter, this outer world becomes as mysterious as the inner. The outer world about which I feel so confident is after all only *my version* of the outer world. My neighbor's version may be quite different. Oliver Wendell Holmes has a cheerful little chemical figure of speech in which he compares our views of truth to the various chemical compounds. Applying the figure here we may say that the outer world varies with the individual's outlook. Smith, Jones and Robinson may have different views of the real world of which we talk so confidently. These may represent a Smithate, a Joneside and a Robinsonite of the outer world.

This whimsical way of looking at the world is not so otiose as it seems. It has a very practical bearing on the teacher's work. His business is to superintend the production of these metaphorical *-ates*, *-ides* and *-ites*. A large part of the work of the school is to build up this common outer world into the particular inner world that functions in the experience of junior Browns, Joneses and Robinsons. No doubt the teacher must work from without, but his results are produced within, and to these juniors is left the task of organizing the elements of the outer world into a consistent whole under the conditions of their inner world. Here we find the need for that internal harmony which we have already mentioned. Matters must be so presented to the pupils that no contradictions will arise in their internal version of the outer world.

The process of confrontation by means of which old Socrates did his best to keep the inner world free from errors only emphasizes the fundamental need of maintaining that world as an organic whole, as integrity. That American educators have not been neglectful of the spirit of integralism in the past is proved by the hectic wave of Correlation that swept over the land towards the end of last century. Educationists were up in arms against the rigid watertight compartment system under which each subject of the curriculum was treated as a little realm of its own which allowed no communication with other similar realms. The reaction to this isolation policy led to almost comic excesses. But the attraction of the docendum was too strong to allow this promiscuity to reassert itself.

The question remains: will this new appeal for Integralism that comes to the United States *via* France have any better luck? Has there been real progress since its last eclipse? The new approach has certainly a better background since the problem implicit in Integralism has brought itself to the notice of American educators in a quiet but very effective way. The various plans and systems that make up what is popularly called the New Education all involve more or less directly the need for a unifying principle, and the implicit Integralism of America and the explicit Integralism of France will have deserved well of our craft if they have revived in a practicable form an educational policy that the world badly needs, though it hardly realizes what exactly is lacking.

We must not be too much alarmed at the outcry of the French theorists on the one hand, or on the other too complacent with things as they are. The position is quite hopeful. It is perhaps impossible to accept M. Lavisse's proposal to turn the whole faculty of a school into a collective unit to act upon each individual pupil: but on the other hand we have seen that it is within the range of practical school politics to increase the solidarity of the school faculty, and inspire it with a broader interest than at present exists in the relation between the specialist subject-matter, and the individual minds into which it has to find its way.

How the Integralist movement will develop in America is of course on the knees of the gods, but without claiming any share in the prophet's mantle I would timidly suggest that a probable line of development may be the establishment of a new group of educational functionaries whose business is to correlate the various branches of the curriculum of the schools with the special needs of the individual pupils. Like a wise apprentice-prophet I naturally base my predictions on what has happened in the past. In America of the present we already have a functionary that is only gradually developing in England. The English Director of Education is still in the first place an administrator: in America he is a technical educationist who takes a firm and expert hand in organizing the work not only on the material side of school organization but in the actual work of the classroom. He is an official that I like to call an educational engineer. The emergence of those officials whom we have referred to as teacher-deans is another support of the theory that the problem of Integralism may be solved in America by the development of a class of specialists, or more probably by the utilization of officials already in existence. Their work, however, ought to be mainly inspirational. In the last resort the effective integralization of education must be carried out by the teachers themselves. The educational engineers, while blazing the trail, must depend on the actual teachers to work up the practicable road.

It will be interesting to watch the development of the integralist ideal in England and in America. It is needed on both sides of the Atlantic, since, though in the case of the few who can enjoy the luxury of a housemaster the problem is already solved, for the great mass of English youngsters the need for integralization is as great as in America. Probably in England the ideal will be gradually attained by a spread among the school faculties of a deeper sense than at present of the need for such a solidarity of feeling and aim as shall insure the organization of a unified system that will satisfy the integralist demands. In America the movement will give rise to a great deal of deliberate and able discussion; the tendency towards organization and standardization will have free play; and in due course a general scheme will be adopted. In America integralization will be established with pomp and circumstance and striking efficiency. In England it will probably just come about.

4

Baron Paul D'Estournelles de Constant

COMMENT ON A BASIC TEMPO

4

COMMENT ON A BASIC TEMPO

Baron Paul D'Estournelles de Constant

PROFESSOR OF FRENCH LITERATURE AND CIVILIZATION, SCRIPPS COLLEGE
[EDUCATED IN FRENCH LYCÉES AND THE UNIVERSITY
OF THE SORBONNE, PARIS]

EVERY year America sends a great number of her youth to carry on their studies in France. They come to us when in the neighborhood of their twentieth year,—twenty-two, ordinarily, for they have obtained their first "college degree."

Of these young persons we know nothing — save it be that they are come from Colorado or from Massachusetts, from Carolina or from Maine, that they are in appearance still incredibly young, that they are eager to see "all that there is to see," and that we find them temperamentally congenial.

For them we are (among other opportunities) the "European chance,"— and they seize it by the forelock!

On this basis of relationship, the majority, on both sides, appear ready to rest content. It constitutes, in effect, a point of departure. But if perchance one wishes to see develop something other than merely superficial contacts, it would seem essential to seek to pierce the cloud of ignorance which now masks the possible amplitude of this movement in the future.

There is no doubt that for the American of to-day the venture into Europe tends to become current event, sometimes also an important event, according as his sojourns find him indifferent, closed, or on the contrary receptive of the world which surrounds him. Twenty-two is an impressionable age:

it is also the age in which the young American may begin to look behind him, or at least to perceive the decidedly good as well as the questionable effects of his previous education. The object of this brief study, considering the problem from a French point of view, will be to show how the greater part of these young folk are reared and formed according to a certain *donnée,* a certain interpretation of the external world, for the moment predominant.

The difficulty upon which one stumbles when one attempts any study of instruction in the United States is of surrendering, once for all, consideration of the country as a compact bloc (demountable, however, and readjustable as to its parts), as a certain type of French logic would be tempted to do. In problems touching education, more than in other domains, there is encountered so great a number of currents, very few sharing any central impulse, that it is necessary at the outset to renounce all attempt at classification and often even at any order.

One of the dangers and also one of the great advantages of American methods is the multiplicity of their initiatives — danger because of the tendency constantly to break the rhythm of efforts hardly as yet outlined, advantage because of the salutary shock which new attempts deliver to administrative torpors. Whether the matter be the advent of small colleges with limited enrollment, or whether it be the creation of a zone intermediate between High School and College, called the Junior College, each year brings new colors to the picture. Nevertheless, though the methods or tendencies differ, not only as between the states but even as between institutions co-existing within the same state, and though it is necessary to give us disentangling all the threads and to deplore a certain consequent incoherence, it none the less holds that the American student, candidate for his diploma, remains of a type little enough variable. And this uniformity even has its importance, for it would tend to show that in spite of the variety of the frames and of the knocks and shake-ups of pedagogical technique, there subsists in American education an element imbued with a singular vigor — since it succeeds in giving to thousands of young people the appearance of issuing from a single mold.

One thing remarkable this mold offers to the eyes of the observer, namely, that it is fashioned far less by any concourse of the efforts of the group called educators than by a series of influences difficult to reduce to simple expression but which are none the less its determinants. Whether he have received his diploma in a university of the East or of the West, of the Mid-West or the South, and whether he come forth from a small routine college or from an institution celebrated for its hardihood, the young American will in effect have been cradled during four years, before and above all, to a tempo exalting his self-confidence. And just here one is tempted to draw a parallel, if not a contrast: in France we seek to develop in the pupil a sort of knowledge obtained by force of what was in the Sixteenth Century termed *curiosité*, that is to say, care, scrupulous method; we consider these two words *knowledge* and *curiosity* as being the two poles of an education of the critical powers, of the critical mind, and of that which the English sometimes call "judgement."

In the United States it would seem that the pupils are at once put in the presence of a world which is to be not so much an object of speculation or of a play of the mind as a stimulant of energies and a theme of action. This conception, different as it may be from our own, has none the less its beauty: it recalls notably the epoch of those American pioneers of the frontier of hardly twenty years ago for whom the words "adventure" and "future" were synonyms, and precisely because this frontier was fascinating with change it became for them an inescapable summons "out West," that is to say, to action.

These twenty years have effectuated miraculous transformations, but a certain spirit remains; the frontier appears to be now fixed, for a good while, following the coasts of the Pacific, but the rhythm of march, which is the rhythm of confidence, through its acquired speed persists, creating, as we shall see, precisely where the concern is education, the presence of danger.

The most hasty of the American tourists is struck by the drab austerity which surrounds our lycées and the greater part of our French universities. The lightest of French observers, traversing the United States, looks with astonishment upon the smiling welcome of its colleges. These two reactions, superficial if they be, are none the less born of genuine causes. The first encouragement to confidence, in the United States, is in effect the surroundings which bring it, the environment into which the pupil is summoned for his instruction. Into his college the boy enters with pride, the young girl with a smiling assurance,— for they will hear, from the gates, issuing from the dormitories the sound of phonographs inviting to the dance! It seems indeed that the first impression which is meant to be conveyed to the young people is that of being very much at home, that is, not between four walls but in an element substantial and expansive which only asks of them that they share in its strength and growth. Parks, mountain lakes, sun, snow, ocean, all the abundance of a natural setting that can range from charm to grandeur is offered not as a luxury but as an element through which the student will nourish himself by the same right as through his course of studies. As to the interiors of the edifices, the same preconcern will cause to reign there (not to mention in the fraternities and the clubs) a reassuring comfort. Provision appears to be made, even for the numerous cases where the ill-endowed student, the unintelligent, or simply the lazy, may have a tendency to permit himself to become discouraged because of poor grades or the too great difficulty of studies: for this sort of student there exists, in effect, the safeguard of all sorts of activities, aside from classes, where it will be permitted him to shine. In particular the field of sports will give an admirable opportunity for whoever, in default of mind, possesses muscle, to win applause in becoming the idol of a fervent public. But sports do not form the only addition to the happy and confident equilibrium of the student; there exists also in the colleges a knowing organization of what in France we call the *à côtés,* understanding by this all that can adorn, rejoice, distract,— as if the arid aspect of a classroom, or of the course of studies, properly so called, were having the advantage of being camouflaged by shows that own only a very remote relationship to it. Only those who have dwelt upon the grounds of the colleges themselves can take account of the importance which the students attach to their *à côtés*, such as dances, parties, societies, fraternities, sororities, football games,— *à côtés* which are not far, in the final account, from being enough to cause the program of studies to appear, if not as a detail, at least as without a significance which one does not know how to reduce to its proper proportions, and over which there is desired but the power to glide as swiftly as possible.

So strong is the fear of ennui, and (O paradox!) of idleness, that ingenuity studies to contrive the better and better organization of amusements, until the campus sometimes ends by taking on a sort of perpetual holiday allure, as of a Sunday picnic which without hesitation is extended to the length of the week. This is so much the case that one must ask himself how the student worker manages to withdraw at all from these powerful external influences which pull him, tempt him, and in any case take from him a good part of his energy. Moreover, it is often difficult to distinguish which are the extra-curricular activities wastefully dispersive and which, on the contrary, form a stimulus to work. There are, for example, in a great number of institutions in the United States "little theaters," schools of the theater, studios, etc., where are brought under way the most excellent undertakings and which achieve sometimes results which our university establishments should envy. But the greater portion of these distractions do not simplify the problem, and it is these that give the force of their presentation of college life to the student.

Further, one may ask if the ensemble of these obstacles to work does not end by stimulating the student who wishes to attain the most to an effort of concentration which is of itself fruitful; and if the good side of a bad system does not here show itself. For there are in American education a certain number of efforts, exacted if not by the programs at least by the circumstances, which without doubt possess a strong educational value: as the task, often arduous, of those young people who are denied financial resources and are obliged, in addition to their work in course, to "work their way through."

It is here that we should guard ourselves from judging American instruction in limiting attention to "class work";

we should never forget that the "class work" is only a part of the formation of these adolescents, of whom some will develop almost wholly apart from their curriculum of studies. This matter seems so much the more important in that it constitutes at once the weakness and, seen from a certain angle, the strength of the whole system.

Thus is outlined, even before intervention of teachers, an education by environment, the strong action of which upon the mind of youth may so much the more run its free course in that all its "à côtés" are non-existent officially in the programs presented by the directors and the presidents of the colleges. Among these educators there are those, certainly, who readily avail themselves of these external activities, while others, who perceive above all the dangers, wish rather to stifle their growth.

But here we touch upon a delicate point: in what measure is it the members of the corps of instructors who act upon what is called, by a name dangerously vague, the "college spirit"? It must not be forgotten that what forms the external and architectural beauty of American institutions of education (from the football fields to the laboratories), and often also what gives value to certain parts of the instruction there undertaken, in great part comes from private gifts, the generosity of which does not wish, rightly, a blind exercise. Whether it concern the trustees proper, the alumni, or anonymous donors, the important factor of which the educators must take account is the very existence of a certain mass of money coming from a personal source, external to what in France we call Public Instruction,—a weight of money, consequently, capable of pressing upon certain undertakings to the point of suffocation with as much ease as, in other cases, they may be favored and as by miracle made realizable. Not that it is necessary to conclude that the liberty of instruction of American colleges is submitted to the caprices of its guardians: such a conclusion would be not only hasty but in many cases unjust, for the donors in general show themselves to be as self-effacing as they are devoted to the institution which they enrich. But their support none the less represents an autonomous weight, of itself very important, upon which it is necessary to count,—

since the gift, for instance, of a swimming-pool, a chapel, or a laboratory, if often only a point of departure for a renewing of generosity which will not fail to be exercised provided that the college follow tendencies at least in general in harmony with the educational ideal of the donor. Again, the affair is not here one of a dictatorial state of mind, but quite simply of the very natural desire to make, in the domain of endowments as well as in the more material realms, what is called a good investment.

Moreover, it is precisely this group, the existence of which ought not to be underestimated, which in adding itself to the smiling attraction of the milieu, will create in great part that state of optimism to which we have all along been making allusion. What more natural? These persons form, indeed, a nucleus, composed in the main of business men who are in the way of amassing or have just amassed their fortunes and who will be inclined to view problems of education under their most empirical aspect; that is to say, in most cases they will regard that method best which the most efficiently prepares the young man for what is vaguely called "life," understanding thereby the struggle for livelihood, competition: for (one must say the word) "success." And it is just here that shines in all its dangerous glory the untranslatable "leadership," a quality of the elect, in which self-confidence is the essential element.

The problem is large, and here we can only indicate it; but the most superficial acquaintance with the content of the catalogues of the different universities leaves no doubt as to the enormous importance attaching to the inclusion in the diplomas, in addition to their purely scholarly bearings, of a certification of capacity in the character of "leader." Coming from Europe, one can hardly believe how complete in some cases is the fusion of the idea of success with that of the height of university culture. One has, indeed, the impression of finding oneself in the presence of a sort of mysticism. We have read compositions of students who do not hesitate to wed with God the prosperity of their country, making of God the ally of "success." Many trustees, many guardians of colleges, will be the first, obviously, to protest against these tendencies, but it is none the less true that a great number will wish to direct college instruction toward the formation of young men who will be before all good citizens, loyal, prosperous, and capable of impressing their "leadership." And as for that, what more natural than such a tendency among men who owe their own success, their fortune, and what they esteem their happiness, to methods wherein what counts before all is self-confidence (followed by a certain "hard-boiledness," gradually attained) ?

Thus the student, submitted from the outset to a state of mind spread throughout the college, cannot fail to "swell his chest" — or, as we say, *bomber le torse.* For what is there that could suggest to him humility? Perchance one may say, religious services? But apart from the fact that the great number of students attend them only casually or as a matter of routine, we have seen that such services may end, in spite of the paradox, by attaining the contrary of their intended result. Again, the instruction, properly so called? And here we should note the courageous effort of a number, each year augmenting, of persons who seek to correct the tendency which we indicate. College presidents, professors, writers, do not hesitate to proclaim the urgent need of reform; nay, they do not stop with proclamation, they put themselves to the task. Already we can discern certain institutions which seek to escape from the malaise of this optimism of leadership. These have perceived and seek to retain what in American education is most unique and notable: its adaptability, the freshness of its forms, the healthfulness of its establishments due in part to the precious gift of space, the fine possibilities opening out from new groupings, the unstereotyped presentations of studies which keep the student from vegetating,— for if distraction by the dose is a nuisance, there is still no reason why boredom should be raised into a cult! And these have seen, also, the spiritual gain which can be drawn from confidence proportionably and in a general manner imparted — imparted with what Montaigne has called *"de si beaux commencements naturels."*

But one must not forget that while such efforts are encouraging and meritorious, they are yet scant-sown: the general tendency which remains appears to be sharply to fortify the student's confidence rather than to refine his judgment.

Perchance this American quest of force stabilized by confidence responds to a need for satisfying certain tendencies of a middle-class citizenship for whom fortune, often rapidly acquired, has very brusquely overturned the normal scale of values?

A professor to whom was posed the question, replied that here we are making no error, that there has indeed been the danger of developing too soon a spirit of unrest among youth just issuing from the High School and fundamentally unprovided with any sense of proportion. "This sense of proportion," said my respondent, "is essentially a French quality, implanted from infancy and permitting to your instruction far more liberties at the price of infinitely minor dangers."

But is it not possible to ask precisely this: if our envied sense of proportion does not in part come from the fact that the pupil with us encounters a subject-matter vastly less gracious and more difficult than does the American student? from this, that our instruction obliges him to measure himself with the dimensions, which may appear dizzy, of an abstract world?

For there is the danger under the pretext of instilling confidence of falling into the excess which lies in rendering the presentation of studies too easy, each student being persuaded that he is in possession of a "personality," and what is worse, that he is in the right in awaiting but the touch of the magic wand of a professor to reveal for him this personality. In America the balance leans too far to the side of those primary illusions which are nourished when for the first time the problems of the education of the masses become preoccupation. In the effort to present to the youth an image of the world invariably optimistic and for once to obtain this "chesty" confidence, this precious "*bombage de torse*," let there be guard lest the attitude persist, and from means become end in itself!

What should come to the support of our comment is the sensible difference that separates the methods in use in a college for young women and a college for young men. Among the students of the former frequently is found a care for measure and exactitude less empirically attached to the notion of success. In regard to them the directors and guardians of the college feel themselves beating a rhythm which impels less vividly to action. In spite of the number of young girls who wish to earn or must earn their living, there reigns in their colleges a certain detachment from the immediate that permits already of serious undertakings. It is not improbable that it may be these colleges which little by little will point a more rigorous way to the generality of institutions. The matter is one of conflicting tendencies, or perhaps of an emulation among tendencies,— more profoundly also of a misunderstanding which only the years can resolve, a misunderstanding that extends far beyond the American world: a confusion of application with thought of liberty with happiness, of merit with success.

At this present moment, the young Americans are still being formed for "success." The authorized methods possess efficacy, in the sense that they are indisputably potent. They create a youth solid and confident which finds itself at the outset sheltered from many of our reticences, our closenesses, our delayings. They furnish examples which one may admire and which may be only steps to other examples which should be followed: certainly, in any case, they have life. But they suffer, in spite of the proverb, from an abundance of goods. In their desire to escape the ills of "worry," which is often weakness, they sin by excess of confidence in the value of confidence itself.

American youth are not called upon for military service. In our country the passage into the barracks bears the charge of a certain hardening of the skin more or less surely or happily obtained; at least there is never any confusion of ideas, and the young recruit to whom the under-officer barks, "Stiffen your calves! Throw out your chest!" is never affected by the thought that this cultivates him. Is this to say that to Europe may be reserved the sad privilege of giving to the young graduates from America their first lesson in pessimism? Perhaps in truth, the matter is one of neither optimism nor pessimism — words which one should use only with clear understanding.

But surely there is desirable a more conscientious touch with reality: in default of a rapid modification of pedagogical conceptions, the exaction of certain social and economic facts, for example, may very speedily build into a new zone of clarification; for prosperity undergoes its oscillation. If any should exclaim that there is danger of stifling American idealism by an overcritical spirit, we should reply that, on the contrary, our concern is to aid the generations to come to eliminate a tone which all of a sudden may seem to them to ring false, perchance in the midst of their fairest dreams.

5

Friedrich Schönemann

A GERMAN LOOKS AT AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

5

A GERMAN LOOKS AT AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Friedrich Schönemann[1]

PROFESSOR OF AMERICAN LITERATURE AND CIVILIZATION,
UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN
[FORMERLY PROFESSOR AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY]

HIGHER education in the United States of America is to-day what it has grown to be, and its history explains its strength as well as its weakness. Its progress is conditioned by its very developments, and European critics should, as a matter of course, not expect ideas and methods or reform movements which are foreign to America's soil and historical and psychological background.

America is too large a continent to bear hasty generalizations although a certain standardization, as mainly enforced by the practical needs of the nation, may invite rather summary judgments. The forty-eight states of the Union with almost as many school systems preclude monotony as well as perfect unity and thus defy definition and criticism. Very good high schools and colleges are neighbors to exceedingly poor ones, and high-grade instruction and pedagogical excellency rub elbows with inefficiency and make-believe. Needless to say that all this tends to make the American educational situation an almost hopeless maze for foreign students, while, at the same time, it often causes both the American and the foreign critic to distribute praise or blame where they do not belong.

---

[1] The author, now professor of American literature and civilization and director of the American Department of the English Seminar at the University of Berlin, taught more than eight years in different American colleges and was the only German citizen who without interruption lectured at an American university (Harvard 1913-1920) through the years of the World-War. He has been teaching in German universities for about nine years, a pioneer in promoting in Germany the study of the history of American literature and civilization.

Within the United States one can only speak for certain more or less defined regions and even then is likely to fall into comfortable errors. Before judging one must always take into consideration the historic origin and age of the region in question. When venturing an opinion of the educational position of the South, for instance, it is necessary to consider first the cultural after-effects of the Civil War, the race question included, and then expect the new industrialism to show its reflection in the new schooling. How the old and the new South are still in conflict may well be seen in the religious issue and in its educational progress. Are those home critics right who accuse the people of the new South of only two main life interests, viz., capital and religion? Or is fundamentalism in higher education only another "rivet in grandfather's neck"?

When viewing, on the other hand, the new educational prosperity of the Far West, under the leadership of California, one is struck with the observation of how little native westerners know of the Eastern states and their educational accomplishments. To-day, I think, the West has to be taught more of the East than vice versa. For several decades there has been a pronounced radicalism of the middle West or the "Valley of Democracy." Soon you will have to guard against California heresies in education; some western educators even go so far as to dream of a higher education without the troublesome teaching of foreign languages, apparently assuming that the new Pacific era in American civilization will be another splendid isolation.

Another "Americanism" with which the foreign student finds himself confronted lies in the absence of an American theory of education. If one desires to summarize the educational situation, say, in Germany or Great Britain, one would have merely to look up the prevalent theories of German or English education and, then, to investigate how far the schools practically live up to the recent theories of their educators and administrators. Thus one can rather easily check up the facts, both as to men and methods, with the "*Bildungs-ideale.*" Such a procedure is out of the question when it comes to the United States of America.

The average European is, therefore, apt to misinterpret an educational system without clearly defined principles and theories. Natural growth is easily mistaken for mere wildness and unrelated freedom, and in the many entanglements of facts the very existence of ideals, even if not theories in the scientific sense, is overlooked only too often. Democracy in education is not only a problem, but, properly interpreted, also an ideal of American education, and it may even lead to a systematic approach to the fundamental aims of education. Such progress is, however, based on the assumption that educational democracy means more than mere self-complacency or a popular enthusiasm for education.

A certain confusion in American education, easily explained by its history, is also responsible for the often alarmistic comments upon this or that phase of foreign influence. If America were not concerned so enthusiastically about just "going," without really caring where she goes, she might, for instance, face the problem of the "Germanizing" of her schools more judiciously. Fundamentally, it cannot really be the question of how much German or English educational matter or method is to be imported into America, but rather, how American needs in education are to be met under American circumstances, and how the American spirit shall come out more purely, maturely and successfully.

I think, there can be no doubt that the German university spirit and part of its system were instrumental in forming an American university out of an English college, even though Americanized to a great extent. This Americanizing process was mainly due to the general training of numberless Americans in German universities and to the German character of a large portion of the American people. The adaptation of German models, as far as it existed, was naturally not always wise and to the point, but Americans cannot very well blame the German university for it,— just as so much of the so-called

Americanization of Europe cannot be blamed on America, since it is chiefly due to an unintelligent imitation on the part of Europeans too ignorant or too blind to see American civilization in its true light and perspective.

Now, any wrong or dangerous "Germanizing" cannot be righted by another unwise move, viz., an overemphasis on British models of academic culture. And the recent Oxford complex is, in principle, not better or more promising than the old Goettingen or Berlin idea in university training.

The British system, though excellent in some ways, first of all, in individual accomplishment, fails in the very democratization of education. Even the best leadership — along Oxford cultural lines — does not succeed if the masses are not adequately prepared for being led or if they are treated negligently, as they undoubtedly were on the British Isles up to a quite recent date.

Furthermore, with the English educational method you can cultivate pigeon-holed minds and even narrow-mindedness just as readily as, say, with German or American "pedantic" methods, aside from the important fact that the English woman's education has lagged much behind that of the English gentleman. The leadership in women's education that belongs to the Germany and America of to-day is due to the same democratic impulses that have made the elementary school an early pride of both America and Germany.

I for one think that, instead of denouncing each other for our own failures and bad imitations, we should rather put our heads together and try to find individual remedies for our common ailments. Germany and America are both suffering from democracy in education. The difference is only in degree, not in substance or nature. The demands of mass education have, doubtless, already led to a lowering of standards, and, perhaps, more so in America than in Germany. In both cases the vital problem is how to preserve or develop thoroughness or even universality in harmony with expansiveness or extensive training methods. We may not like our common evils, but we will have to face and ultimately to efface them. And I truly believe that further coöperation between American and German educators is invited, indeed demanded, by the logic of events; for both countries seem still to represent two opposites, and the pedagogical good, like all other good, lies between extremes.

The basic object of education is man. How the Americans view man, decides their system of education both in its aim and in its methods. Here it is to their credit that the home-grown spirit of their Declaration of Independence also pervades their private and public schools, their high schools and their colleges. This does not mean that they find the perfection of spiritual independence. They too can only form the ideal concept and leave all else to the perfect work of patience. But the aim is high enough and worth while working for. Every teacher should proclaim the gospel of freedom and equality before he begins his day's work; but if he is wise, he will not do so in the hearing of his students, but rather enter into his closet, and he will surely be "rewarded openly."

The most casual observer of American life must notice a rather unique child psychology. It seems to me that America is a paradise much more for children than for women, but a paradise with another serpent in it. Nowhere on earth, I think, is a child of three or four years asked about its opinion and decision, whether it pleases to obey or not, and if not, why not. Here arguing with children has become a kind of national art. The best-intentioned argument does not, however, do away with the necessity of obeying, and experience rather shows that children are not more susceptible to an appeal to reason than their elders. The quick, almost automatic (or call it natural, instinctive, if you please) reaction to a friendly, but firm command is much easier to give and to take. It certainly saved trouble for both parent and child. Besides, the very foundation of education is turned if educator and educated argue as though they were on the same plane, and if implicit trust in the governor mind is to be replaced by the ill-famed "consent of the governed."

This means, of course, a much too early introduction into the child life of the spirit of independence and naturally shows its consequences in education, first of all, in a certain unsound precocity of intellect. Childhood like spring has thus too short a season in the American clime. There the child is wrongly treated as a grown-up *en miniature.* The Germans, on the other hand, easily go to the opposite extreme by treating their children as mere children far too long. They err in creating a sort of glorification of the oldsters, where the Americans end in a rather sentimental cult of the child. This national tendency also shows itself in later life. American parents wish it to be understood that they are "quite as young" as their children, no matter of what age. Men are nothing but grown-up boys, as a famous slogan runs. And American youth apparently never waxes old.

Psychologically, there is a great difference between the ages in life, not a difference of human matter of kind, but of experience of and outlook towards life, a different attitude to fellow-beings included. If common sense rather than sentimentality prevailed, many grotesque and, at times, fateful mistakes might remain unmade. Pedagogically, the precocious child is not so very different from the self-taught man, as characterized by Mark Twain in his essay on *Taming the Bicycle.* Says he, "The self-taught man seldom knows anything accurately . . . and, besides, he brags, and is the means of fooling other thoughtless people into going and doing as he himself has done." In American education precocity is responsible for some bad results.

Furthermore, there is an abundance of "purpose" put into the child's life. Any too conscious effort, of course, destroys much of the naïveté and imagination of youth, of the beauty of playfulness, of all kinds of childlike instincts and inclinations. Here it is again characteristically American that "boys' worker" has become a new profession. This shows how much loving care is given to boyhood, but also how much is carried into childhood that is utterly foreign to it. Good behavior is all right with young and old, but one should not endeavor to make independent boys into society-bound citizens or even well-satisfied Babbitts. The great danger is that all the humdrum of adult life is imposed upon youth, and that the very genius of youth is thereby hopelessly crowded out.

In American college life one is again and again astonished at finding so little of genuine individualism. The German university student, even the beginner who about equals the junior student's age, is much more vigorously independent in his ways of thinking and feeling, of forming and expressing opinions, of dressing and living. His often extreme individualism may, later in life, confuse politics and endanger a united national life, but it minimizes early standardization and furthers intellectual keen-mindedness and doubt, the spring of all spiritual progress. It is not a matter of "youth movement" in Germany, as many Americans seem to imply, but a matter of intellectual unrest among all the youth of the land, a youth deeply interested in ideas, even on fire with great ideals.

Youth in America is in danger of being complacent, full of self-satisfaction and prejudice, partly because middle-aged or elderly people's ideas, slogans and enthusiasms of life are introduced into youth far too early and persistently.

The same objection is valid concerning the early economic interests of the young. It may be a national asset that the average American is born with good business instincts in general and the gift for organization in special. But I doubt if it pays educationally to further this preoccupation too early in life. Thinking of all the sport, business, civic and what not interests of the American school children up to high school and college age, one wonders when their scholarly interests are promoted and how they are enabled intellectually to get the most out of their studies. It may be another characteristic of American education to make the children learn early how to stand on their own legs, economically speaking, but the same tendency is, doubtless, also responsible for great impediments in the mental development of the students.

Now, whereas the American parents really waste their precious energy on their children between three and thirteen, they are rather weary of giving the right amount of attention and care to their children up to eighteen, who are often really allowed "simply to grow." After early childhood has, in a way, been pestered with the responsibilities of adults, the following plastic age is left empty and wild, when complete freedom is more of a curse than of a bliss or, at least, is a greater risk if not properly prepared for or assisted. No wonder there has happened an American "Revolt of Modern Youth." But more important has been the educational effect of the false premature freedom of youth, which, once a habit, is hard to overcome in theory as well as in practice. This, to my mind, explains some of the most flagrant shortcomings in America's higher education.

Here it is certainly just as risky as elsewhere to generalize. Not a few of the American high schools do praiseworthy work, teach their students conscientiously and well, even train them how to work. But in a majority of cases, the American high school pupils are not given the worthwhile intellectual basis of an education for life. Between the ages of fourteen and eighteen, when the German children receive their most thorough preparation for their future professions and quite a creditable general education, the young Americans play and enjoy themselves, excel in all youthful activities and accomplishments except the habit of learning and the true ability of working out intellectual tasks. Not that they lack in interests, in matters of international significance or world-wide appeal, but they do not learn the art of studying, the economy of mind, or get the skill of study or enough and reliable information, in short, are trained to recognize facts and to think about them. They are not initiated into the beginning of wisdom, namely, the understanding that in life no mastery is earned without hard and trying years of apprenticeship.

Not her grammar school, but her high school is thus America's weakness, and this is mostly responsible for her reputation as the best half-educated country on earth. For a sound college education cannot well build on shaky foundations.

American education has often fallen short of its own high ideal of man. It has allowed the spirit of man to be ruled by the spirits of many men, of administrators and the builders of huge castles and cathedrals of knowledge, of city and state politicians, of newsmongers and of capitalists, of half-educated clergymen and fanatics.

Education all over the world demands its rightful equipment. Research work above all other is dependent upon the necessary means to carry it out. German universities of today often feel the economic pinch of their home country and see their highest endeavor frustrated or impeded through inadequate housing or the lack of funds for books and other tools of learning. But American college authorities go much too far in the other direction. They erect buildings after buildings, taking care of the exteriors of education without giving due attention to the interior, the soul of it. If to-day a full third of all the newly-built college halls were not existing, American education would hardly be the worse for it. College education at its best has always been and will always be primarily a matter of men, not of buildings, of soul and not of equipment. "But," says Emerson, "we need not fear that we can lose anything by the progress of soul. The soul may be trusted to the end."

Practical men have long been pointing out that many pompous-looking college halls are only a waste of money, and certain colleges rightly but courageously refuse funds for buildings without the money necessary to run them. But more is urgently needed, in a word, the rationalization of college funds. For the waste of the dear old system is really of a much greater and more pernicious extent than is openly known or acknowledged. In this respect, I think, many faculties have gone the way of the least resistance instead of fighting for the means of their life. For have not the many drives for college funds utterly failed to stop the proletarizing of the younger men in the college teaching profession down to even thereby prohibiting sound family life?

I have seen much need in the circles of the German *Privatdozenten* and the many assistant professors enjoying the title, but neither the position of a regular professorship nor the income thereof, but all of my German experiences have been overshadowed by the several cases of American college instructors' misery that have come under my personal observation. The average underpaid college instructor is a great shame for such a rich and prosperous country as the United States and is, furthermore, a reproach to American college men in general. They have missed many opportunities of "teaching" their business friends. In this connection I shall never forget the story of an American friend of mine who had to see an influential business man of his community, the owner of the biggest store in town. After all arguments had failed, my friend in despair said, "But think how terribly underpaid all the professors of our college are. Every floorwalker in your store gets a bigger salary." Whereupon the merchant answered, "But, professor, don't you forget what a *responsibility* a floorwalker has!" This true story happened several years before the Great War. Has American business learned of the responsibilities of a college teacher in the meantime?

Religion deserves to be mentioned next to business in connection with American education, especially in college. The goals of education and religion cannot fail to meet ultimately but religious methods cannot possibly accomplish educational good in a secular university. We barbarians of the World War and of the following peace atrocities have, of course, no right to denounce the Middle Ages as "dark," without which, in the first place, there would be no education at all. But, on the other hand, the progress of higher learning began when with the dawn of our modern age education became fully secularized, freed from all clerical considerations, when "modern" came to mean "secular" without discrediting true religion. This holds for Europe as well as for America.

New England, for instance, was never more powerful within American civilization, than when she stopped being a blue law to herself and her neighbors, and allowed her puritanism to be assuaged and even superseded by deism, unitarianism and finally pragmatism. The general evolution of American college education has also comprised the slow emancipation from clerical rule and supervision, a development furthered by the spirit of the Middle Western State universities and of the women's colleges, both of which do not train for the church, but for a secular profession and more and more invite laymen instead of ministers into their administrations. The rest is done by capital from the business people of this world.

Another great question of American college life is the part played by politics. As a German I cannot view universities other than as state institutions, and, on the whole, short periods of political reactionary rule excluded, our system has worked well. State interference has been less marked and less often than a critic of state education might expect. As a matter of course, the German monarchical state could not well suffer men of avowed revolutionary tendencies to remain on the faculties of its universities. And just as naturally this might mean harm to a single "*Sozialdemokrat*" who happened to be a university teacher. But even to-day, in republican Germany, the majority of our university teachers and students being national-minded (not nationalistic!), the position in the faculty, of a socialist, especially of the professional internationalistic type, is not quite easy. Give him tactlessness, a host of conflicts will arise. But the general accusations of our socialists and a few party democrats against our "reactionary" universities, as true seats of monarchism and anti-democracy, are surely not justified by the facts.

This German item is merely meant to suggest the chief difficulty in question, viz., to distinguish clearly between the limits of politics and education. As a German I can, therefore, sympathize with conditions in American state-universities, partly framed after the Prussian experience. I think that "Jacksonian Democracy" must needs lead to the state control of all higher education, that the manifold tasks of mass education could not be attacked by other than state authority and that popular education was only guaranteed by the democratic state system with its taxing ability and without the control of religious sects.

The state colleges and universities of the Middle West have made history in American education. They have richly contributed to the democratization of all education which, as is hardly necessary to say, has not always been a benefit. They have helped to make education popular, an accomplishment that is not to be underrated in view of the pioneer's suspicion against all book learning and school ideas and of his belief in a kind of Jack-of-all-trade-ism. But they have not been able to make education palatable to pioneer society without making it "practical," and this again has led to a lowering of the standard of both the students and the subjects taught. For it is one thing to offer a "college education" free to all and another thing to shape the new education so as to make it possible for all to partake thereof. Under this pioneer influence colleges have often become only democratic as to quantity and over-realistic concerning the curriculum arranged for. "Training for life," rightly understood, is the best any educational effort can hope to accomplish, and such "training" may gladly include blacksmithing, bookkeeping, family psychology or the art of advertising, but why subject such studies to "college instruction" and make necessary training schools into impossible "universities"?

There is something wonderful in the Western idea of education, something inspiring, because it makes life itself the uppermost, the guiding and controlling principle in education. Progress is unthinkable without this truly modern impulse, but here as elsewhere moderation spells success. Education cannot be "got" in a jiffy, souls must grow and mature slowly, and culture is not to be harvested in one season. It is no wonder then that educated Easterners and Europeans are somewhat afraid of Western radicalism, and it is a fact that American education would be in a constant crisis of experimentation without the conservative counter-currents of the colleges in the East.

Though the famous Dartmouth College case may have been important enough in calling the attention of the state legislatures to education in general and in furthering the state college in particular, of even greater importance was its immediate consequence, namely to secure and stabilize the privately endowed and incorporated college. I am the last to underrate the accomplishments of the state universities; I cannot, however, but admire the great things done by institutions like Harvard. Their success in individual scholarship and character-discipline, in freedom of research and even of speech (as in the rather recent case of Harvard) has not been excelled by all the democratic zeal of state-controlled education.

Theoretically education in a state is what the majority of its citizens will it, and, in fact, the Middle West can attribute much of its educational progress to the understanding and energy of its men and women. But, practically, state-controlled institutions often become what the politicians make of them. The history of the American state university shows much of parliamentarism of the evil kind. Every granting of funds may mean influence, and "influence" in education is nearly always a bane to orderly development and administration. But of greater import than the money power of representative government is the low or loud working of aggressive minorities. Fanatic voters are able over night to change the best imaginable intentions of the supposedly independent representatives. And important issues of liberal education have thus been poisoned, with the result that only a few, if any, of the state colleges have escaped the vicissitudes of political campaigns and "drives," personalities and movements.

Here we touch upon, perhaps, the greatest problem of democracy. It was right for George Washington to think of self-government only in intimate connection, indeed harmony, with education, but he could not possibly foresee the many practical difficulties of education in a democratic state. His vision of one "American University" was great, yet greater was the country's need for a university after Thomas Jefferson's Virginia model. But what would both of these Americans of the Americans say to the *Zeitgeist* in certain states of their Union, where the legislatures rule what is and what is not forbidden to be taught, be it German one day and evolution another day? Would they deign to call Americanism all that showed during the years of the latest war, when public opinion instead of assisting education, often maligned and ill treated the educators and equaled freedom of thought to "aid and comfort to the enemy"? All this leads, of course, to the questions where in education ends the prerogative of state-power, where begins the inviolable right of the individual, and when is education entitled to and dependent upon protection against public opinion? Another John Stuart Mill will have to write on Liberty in Education.

The potent evil power of public opinion was exposed in war time, but in peace its might has hardly less potentialities and drawbacks, as President Lowell has shown in two excellent books.[2] If only college government were influenced by the people's opinion, it would be a comparatively easy matter, but the very soul of the college may be victimized by an opinion that is public, but neither representative nor right. How to oppose such a false *vox populi* must well be counted among the life problems of both political democracy and democratic education.

---

[2] *Public Opinion and Popular 'Government* (1913); *Public Opinion in War and Peace* (1923).

Finally, take the ominous position of sport in American college life. The last few years have apparently seen a small change for the better. A few colleges proud of their spiritual tradition and sensitive to matters of scholarly and pedagogic reputation, have started to fight the extreme passion for sport in their college bodies. Even the great captains of football or baseball are expected to do some college work, and the victorious teams with their records are not the only records which count. But a radical change is again made impossible by public opinion, by a certain sport propaganda, by ideas and means that are introduced into the students and their teachers from the outside, just as professional baseball has remained the worst imaginable model of college athletics. If you go to the bottom of the whole matter, you do not discover overmuch real sport in the sense that a great majority of the students train their bodies in order to do better mental work. Active games are often replaced by the mere watching of games. On the one side, college sport has become a thing of publicity; and which college in America can afford to go without this kind of publicity, or which college president is wise and brave enough to oppose it?

On the other side, the big financial returns derived from the ticket sale have caused the authorities to close their eyes to the evils of the whole situation, even corruptive practices. The buying and selling of college athletes may be a sport necessary for the semi-youthful enjoyment of certain aged alumni with ample means, but it tends to cheapen both the college and its sports. Any reform, such for example as that advocated by the Carnegie Foundation in its study of American College Athletics (1929), has to do with college athletics as well as with college itself, but the fundamental need is the intellectual renewing of American college life.

It was to the professional honor of the American Association of College Professors that they rendered a verdict against football, but, I think, they weakened their case by generalizing too tamely and by not being specific enough about the vices of excessive college sport. All institutions suffer from the evil conditions, some only more so than the others, and the West like the East. Even at Harvard College, the scholarly standard of which is beyond cavil, many a teacher has already sighed for the degree of absolute authority which the Coach of the football or baseball team enjoys so naturally, an authority almost religiously respected and feared by the students, some professors and the people at large. And any specification of sport vices should include the real happenings — nothing but the truth — at definite colleges and universities during the season in question. For obvious reasons this might, however, turn out to be too risky an endeavor for the college teachers. Perhaps it would be the ideal task of a competent sport writer. At any rate, it would demand the moral strength of Hercules and the writing ability of Upton Sinclair.

The responsibility for the evil results of the existing system of college athletics rests with all those college presidents and deans who do not wish to face the facts. They are the powers which really control campus activities and personalities. If they refuse to listen to reason and the wide-awake members of their faculties, no thorough reform is possible. But they should be made to understand that the spirit of the whole educational system is endangered by their very indulgence, just as it is put in jeopardy by their over-building and under-paying policy, by their obsequiousness in matters pertaining to business and politics.

Finally, the college professors will also have to do their part in repenting and reforming. They have not done everything to prevent college education from becoming a dead affair, so dull, indeed, that its victims may be partly excused for rebelling and finding a natural outlet in the so-called "college activities." If "the Lord won't be censorious when His children have their fling," the teachers should, at least, have a saving sense of humor. Then they should make up for their students' ignorance and negligence by themselves demonstrating a deeper understanding of the ideals and realities in education, a finer pedagogical tact, a saner scholarship and a wider culture.

Here we get to the heart of all education. If we had in our teaching profession more life-giving personalities, there would be more life and creative work in our classrooms and halls, and we would accomplish better results. We must be kindled with genuine enthusiasm if we expect others to be set on fire. In a way, better teachers alone vouch for better students. It will help all students to learn better if better taught.

The question will be asked, of course, how better teachers can be obtained. A general financial and social betterment of the teaching professions would undoubtedly have some good effect; for it would, among other things, induce some excellent men now in business life, men of energetic and even magnetic character, to enter the college career. They might furnish, first of all, competent men for the administration staff or the president's cabinet, thus gradually doing away with a certain system of rewarding poor teachers and worse scholars by administrative jobs. Then, many a handy man around the president's office need not necessarily be fed from a professorship. This would clear the way for normal, rightful promotion of real teachers and deserving research men. But it would also prepare the road for better administrative officers and ultimately lead to specially trained and experienced masters of administration, which the rapid growth of the American colleges and universities will soon demand anyhow.

Teaching as a profession will, however, not only be benefited by an increase of outer and inner inducements, but also by the welcome given by the colleges and universities to education as a science amongst the other sciences. Only time can teach whether recent American developments in this direction are for the better or worse and a warning might not be untimely not to expect the educational millennium by way of the making of numberless Doctors of Education. Already the educational generalist has become, through the American passion for surveys, statistics, and psychological tests, a rather important practical institution. Before the public eye he has taken on far more the form of a medicine man than that of a philosopher of education. And he is, not only by the large public, expected to make education in general and college education in particular more "attractive" than it is, or to bring into a system what college politicians and wise-acres have found to be popular and "working." He should, however, become a kind of philosophic conscience to the whole educational work in the United States. Thus he may contribute much of vital importance to the educational progress and future of America; a contribution which is of interest to the whole modern world.

PART THREE

GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PROBLEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

6

William Chandler Bagley

THE UPWARD EXPANSION OF MASS EDUCATION

6

THE UPWARD EXPANSION OF MASS EDUCATION

Its Causes and Some of the Problems That It Has Raised

William Chandler Bagley

PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE most significant problems that confront higher education in the United States have their roots in an ideal of educational democracy that is uniquely American. The famous characterization of our school system as an educational ladder with its base in the gutter and its tip in the university was perhaps an adequate formulation of this ideal in Huxley's time, but it will scarcely suffice to-day. In certain other countries, very poor children who show outstanding ability find it possible to climb an educational ladder of equal or greater height. An English boy, indeed, if highly competent, has his financial path made even easier than it is for an American boy of comparable talent. Surely the English situation reflects educational democracy of a fairly definite sort. The American ideal of democratic education doubtless had its origin in a desire to place all able and ambitious youth on the same economic footing in respect of opportunities for getting an education, but it has come in the past few decades to have a far less restricted meaning. It embodies a much more literal interpretation of "equality." The earlier notion at least implied that educational opportunities should be provided for all who were both eager and able to embrace them. Here the responsibility was clearly upon the individual who accepted the opportunities offered. The clear tendency to-day is to provide education for all on all educational levels and to hold the educational system responsible on every level for making these opportunities attractive, pleasant, and profitable to all.

Very emphatically, this is a distinction with a difference, and obviously such a change is fraught with possible consequences of serious moment, not only to education but to the character and fiber of the national life. It is the purpose of the present paper to trace the evolution of this change and to set forth some of the problems that it presents, particularly in the field of higher education.

THE outstanding development in American education during the past generation has been the remarkable growth in the enrollment of the high schools and colleges. The ratio of high school enrollment to the total population was more than quadrupled in the thirty-year period between 1896 and 1926. In many American communities to-day secondary education is as nearly universal as was elementary education a generation ago. In 1900, for example, in a typical mid-western city, only one-eighth of the children of ninth grade age were enrolled in ninth grade classes; seven-eighths of these children were either retarded in the lower grades or had dropped out of school. In 1928 the proportions were exactly reversed; seven-eighths were in the ninth grade, only one-eighth had dropped out or were retarded. In California — from this point of view undoubtedly the most progressive American state — an overwhelming majority of the children of high school age are now attending high school.

In spite of the lessened emphasis upon college preparation as a function of secondary education, the expansion of the higher institutions has followed close upon the heels of the high schools' growth. The ratio of college enrollment to the total population was twice doubled between 1906 and 1926, and during the past decade the colleges and universities have been hard pressed to find quarters and instructors for the students who have flocked to them in ever increasing numbers.

While exact comparisons with other countries are difficult because of varying definitions of elementary, secondary, and higher education, certain statements may be made with a fair degree of confidence. In our high schools, public and private, the aggregate enrollment is not far below the combined enrollment in the secondary schools of Europe. In our institutions of collegiate and university grade, the aggregate enrollment is approximately equal to the total number of students on the level of higher education in all other countries. Indeed it is not very far from the truth to say that in the United States more persons above the age of fourteen are in regular full time attendance at school or college than in all other countries combined.[1]

It is clear, then, that the situation which the secondary and higher institutions are facing to-day is not only unique in the history of education but quite unparalleled elsewhere in the contemporary world.

The fact to be given first consideration is that the growth of the high schools and colleges constitutes at basis an upward expansion of mass education, and consequently has involved a radical change in the character both of the secondary school and of the college. Historically these have been essentially selective institutions. If those who sought instruction in them

---

[1] These statements are based in part upon official government reports and in part upon data (chiefly summarized from such reports) published in *Europa* (volume for 1927) and in *The Statesman's Yearbook* (volume for (1929). In most of the other countries, of course, the secondary school enrollment includes a substantial proportion of pupils who in our country would be classed as elementary, and a certain proportion, too, who with us would fall in the college group. The following ratios, based upon the combined enrollments in secondary and higher institutions for the mid-years of the present decade, constitute, I believe, comparisons that do not exaggerate the relative position of the United States in this regard:

Ratio of secondary and higher enrollments to total population

United States	44,184	to	the	million	of	population
Germany	13,605	“	“	“	“	“
England, Scotland, Wales	10,593	“	“	“	“	“
Italy	9,482	“	“	“	“	“
France	5,700	“	“	“	“	“

Some of the smaller European nations — Czechoslovakia, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, and Finland, for example — show higher ratios than any of the European countries named; in no case, however, does the ratio approximate that of the United States.

were not adapted by nature and nurture to the curricula provided and the methods of teaching employed, they were quickly eliminated. Generally speaking there was no thought of obligation on the part of the institutions themselves to adjust their curricula and their methods to the needs and limitations of an unselected group.

Slowly but surely the forces that were making for the growth of the public high schools and later for the growth of the tax-supported colleges and universities forced the selective function into the background and compelled the institutions to assume some measure of responsibility for adjusting their requirements to an increasingly heterogeneous group of pupils and students. A brave showing of "numbers" became increasingly necessary in appeals for public funds — and large numbers are not often consistent with rigorous standards of selection and retention. This need was felt especially in the tax-supported colleges and universities, but it was not without its effect upon the endowed institutions, practically all of which depended for their support in part upon student fees. On the secondary level there was a growing pressure to attract to the high schools as large a proportion as possible of the elementary school graduates and to keep as many of these as possible through the four years. On the elementary level there was an even more powerful pressure to pass pupils through the successive grades "on schedule" and to keep pupils from leaving school prior to the completion of the eighth grade work. It was in the first decade of the present century that "retardation" and "elimination" became the bugaboos of public school administration.

On the side of the curriculum, there came in close succession in the colleges and universities the elective principle and the diversified programs of study; in the secondary school, the differentiation of curricula, the provision of vocational courses, and to some extent the principle of free election; in both types of institution a marked relaxation of the standards governing entrance and graduation.

One of the most important developments had its origin in the need of more skillful teaching for the increasingly heterogeneous groups that crowded into the high schools. The college-trained teacher who had himself passed through the older type of secondary school found the older type of secondary teaching quite inadequate to the task presented by the unselected pupil-groups; — or, if he did not make this discovery himself, the public school administrator made it for him. From school superintendents and high school principals there came to the colleges an increasingly insistent demand that prospective high-school teachers be given some instruction in the theory and art of teaching as part of their college work. This demand (reinforced in many instances by new requirements for obtaining teachers' certificates) the colleges reluctantly answered by appointing professors of "pedagogy," who came a little later to be called professors of "education." While a few chairs of this sort were established somewhat earlier, the movement had its real start in the decade between 1890 and 1900, at the time when the public high schools were rapidly losing their selective function and taking on the characteristics of unselective "mass" schools.

From the outset, the professors of education represented in the colleges and universities the interests of the lower schools and particularly of the new type of high school. This is only to say that the professors of education represented the principle of non-selective education as against the principle of selective education. The latter principle still continued to dominate the colleges and universities; the professors of education in a very real sense were educational democrats living in an academic aristocracy; and their lot was far from happy.

There were, however, compensations. In the period of growth and expansion which was just opening, the professors of education — the educational "generalists"— were in a most strategic position to assume leadership. As a matter of fact the leadership of the great upward movement of mass education was forced upon them. The lower schools looked to them for guidance. More and more, the important posts in public school administration came to be filled by their students. In increasing numbers, public school teachers enrolled in their classes, especially during the summer sessions which developed so remarkably in the second decade of the present century. Beginning about 1910, these professional students of education were called upon with increasing frequency to direct "surveys" of public school systems and to make recommendations as to policies and programs. Beginning soon after 1920, they guided, either directly or indirectly, the far reaching movement in elementary and secondary education which has gone under the name, "curriculum-reconstruction."

It has come about, then, that the persons most influential in American education to-day are neither the scholars in the specialized academic fields nor the school and college administrators, but rather the "educational generalists"— the professors of education and more recently the directors of educational research both in the universities and in state and city school systems. Like the growth that has brought him into existence the educational generalist is uniquely American. And because that growth was in essence a vast upward expansion of mass education, it has been his particular function to rationalize and justify the changes in educational organization, administration, and policy that were necessary in making this expansion possible.

Leaving for the moment the work and influence of the educational generalist, it will be profitable to inquire a little further into the underlying causes of the movement that brought him into being and into power. This is especially important because some of these causes were quite unrecognized by him or by any one else at the time.

The upward expansion of mass education is usually attributed to the rapidly increasing wealth which permitted the release of young people from wage-earning work in larger proportions than had been possible in the past and in larger proportions than is possible to-day in other countries.

There is no doubt that the increasing wealth has been an indispensable factor in bringing about the situation, but in itself it seems to be only a partial explanation of the phenomena in question. As a matter of fact, the forces that have operated to increase wealth have had the effect of stimulating educational expansion in a degree that is over and above the opportunities that the margin of wealth has created. In other words, the forces behind our material prosperity have not only made possible educational expansion; in a fundamental and far reaching sense, they have necessitated educational expansion. The machine has not only released large numbers of men and women from routine work; it has impelled — even necessitated — tens of thousands of young people to prepare themselves for the non-routine occupations — for the kind of work that cannot be done by the machine.

Within the past generation, the Industrial Revolution has taken quite a new turn through the remarkable development of automatically controlled machinery. The fundamental import of this development, however, has only recently been clearly discernible. It is now reported that the number of workers in manufacturing has decreased by at least a million within the decade in spite of a very great increase in production. This means a need upon the part of the displaced workers to adjust themselves to other occupations, and the difficulty of making such an adjustment explains why, in the midst of a material prosperity unprecedented in history, we have had in this country a serious problem of unemployment. The situation is complicated, too, by the decreased need for farm labor which has been due, in part at least, to the increased use of power-driven and automatically controlled machinery in agriculture.

What has clearly happened, then, has been a sharp reduction in the opportunities to earn a livelihood on the routine occupational levels. Compensating for this in part, although only in part, there has been an increase in occupational opportunities on what may be called the "stepped-up" levels where intelligent adaptation rather than routine skill is the important factor. Thus, while the number of routine workers has sharply decreased during the decade, the older professions have increased their numbers, and — what is more significant — many occupations, especially those concerned with business, have moved distinctly toward the professional or semi-professional level in the sense that those seeking employment must meet certain educational standards, both general and specific in character. The larger banks, the great public service corporations, the hotel syndicates, the insurance companies, and the big department stores now have elaborate provisions for training their personnel; and in almost every case those who would seek such training find it distinctly to their advantage to have a good background of general education. Here, too, the curve of growth seems to be distinctly upward. A great engineering corporation reports that ten years ago ninety per cent of its employees were routine and clerical workers; to-day one half of its personnel is made up of highly educated technologists and executives. One of the largest public service corporations in the country, already employing many college graduates in technological and executive posts, plans within the coming decade to double its personnel on the higher level and to reduce substantially the number and proportion of its routine workers.

The upward expansion of American education, then, has been not merely a reflex of material prosperity; beyond this, it has been a response to a fundamental economic need or demand. The complaint that too many young people are attending high school and college is beside the point,— as even more emphatically is the contention that a goodly proportion of these young people should be in overalls or aprons doing the routine work of the world. It is entirely conceivable that some of these young people are better adapted to hewing wood and drawing water than to the work involved in the white-collar jobs. But this again is beside the question. Hewing wood and drawing water can be done and are being done very much more effectively and economically by mechanical slaves.

How far can the influence of these fundamental economic forces be extended? On the side of the machine, the limits seem to be fairly remote. The engineers promise mechanical contrivances that will do any purely repetitive work, however complicated, with a minimum of human control. The sources of power, if not inexhaustible, are still abundant and many of them as yet are untouched. Approximately seventy per cent of the mechanical horse-power generated in the world to-day is generated and used in the United States. Every man, woman, and child in our country has working for him or her the potential equivalent of at least thirty-five slaves. The ratio could undoubtedly be increased substantially within the next two decades.

The vital question, then, concerns the man rather than the machine. Educationally, perhaps, the most important problem is this: How far can the human types that have heretofore done the routine work be fitted for the stepped-up occupational levels? Failure here would seem to necessitate a deliberate slowing down, halting, or even reversal of the forces that are now operating to extend the reign of the machine. I am told that certain industries, even now, have machinery at hand (or at least designed) which would enable them to increase their output and at the same time effect a substantial reduction in the number of workers employed. These improvements, however, are held in abeyance because of the effect that their introduction would have upon the labor market. A gradual adjustment is necessary, and in the long run this must mean an adjustment upward from the routine levels to the stepped-up levels. The most significant question is whether education can mediate this end. The hours of labor — especially of routine labor — will undoubtedly be shortened, and this will take up some of the slack in unemployment; but it cannot entirely solve the problem. The increase in leisure which is clearly predictable already constitutes an important educational problem; but in the last analysis it is not an enlarged leisure that is important but rather an enlarged opportunity; and it is an enlarged opportunity that occupations of the higher grades provide.

If this analysis of the economic forces underlying educational expansion is measurably correct, it would seem to follow that the policies that have accompanied and facilitated educational expansion will need revision. I have suggested that one function of the educational theorist or "generalist" has been to rationalize and otherwise justify a relaxation of standards. In doing this, he has been, I am sure, thoroughly sincere. Many policies that are in effect loosening and softening in an unfortunate sense make an immediate appeal because they can be readily contrasted with stupid, meaningless, and even brutal practices which, it is assumed, have very largely governed education in the past, and some of which are incontestably far from uncommon to-day. It is clearly not to the discredit of the educational theorist that his proposals, in general, have been directed toward an educational régime that would be increasingly more humane, sympathetic, and regardful of individual rights and needs; nor is it difficult to confuse essential rigor with lack of sympathy. With the best of intentions, then, educational theory in the United States has tended in many ways and (in the circumstances) almost inevitably toward a weakening of the educational fiber. It is a stiffening of this fiber that is now in order.

A brief statement of some outstanding policies that reflect this progressive loosening of standards may not be out of place at this point:

1. In both the lower and the higher schools, the elimination of comprehensive examinations covering large units of work.

2. The elimination in many cases of promotional examinations of any sort and the passing of pupils through the elementary and high school grades and into college on the basis of an accumulation of term or semester credits.

3. On the secondary and higher levels, the abandonment of coherent curricula that might be made to reflect some measure of educational continuity and integrity, and the substitution of elective programs comprising a bewildering offering of necessarily short-unit courses.

4. On the elementary level, especially, the evaluation of individual achievement in terms of standards that reflect mass-achievement under average conditions; standards which may and probably do represent lower levels even of mass-achievement than are attainable; a process which may easily operate to standardize mediocrity at an unnecessarily low level.

5. An increasing dependence upon personal charm and an ingratiating manner on the part of the teacher to insure order and industry on the part of the pupils and students, and a fairly deliberate discrediting of such impersonal factors as effortful achievement for its own sake, pride in good workmanship for its own sake, and an ingrained respect for law and order.

Along with these developments, some of which have been in evidence for thirty years or more, there has been on the part of educational theory a rationalized justification of the paths of least resistance in learning. There has been an official and authoritative denunciation of drills, of reviews, and even of systematic and sustained effort on the part of the learner. Most revealing of all, however, has been the denial by educational theory of the possibilities of anything akin to a general discipline. This denial has been predicated upon a number of psychological experiments concerned with the "transfer of training." The actual results of these experiments, while warranting a marked modification of the doctrine of formal discipline in its older and quite naïve form, do not by any means justify the out-and-out denial of disciplinary possibilities that characterizes contemporary educational theory.

The increasing vogue and influence of the so-called "Progressive" school of educational theory are symptomatic, in part at least, of the same general tendencies. The tenets advanced by the more radical wing of this school are especially significant because of the appeal that they make to many members of the lay public who are interested in educational reform. The general position of this more radical wing may be summarized as follows:

1. Education is primarily a process of natural growth,—a growth that must proceed from an inner urge and not from an external compulsion; hence:—

2. The initiative in the learning process must always come from the learner.

3. The continuance of the learning process must be justified at each step by the learner's own recognition of its value in meeting his immediately felt needs or in solving immediate problems that appeal to him as worth solving. A clear implication of the theory is that the learner is to be condoned for avoiding tasks for which he does not feel an immediate yearning or from which he cannot anticipate a pleasurable thrill.

4. Imposed tasks and prescribed programs of study not only violate the inherent right of the learner to make free choices; they are in themselves either futile or negative as educational means.

5. The chief problem of teaching is not to teach in the sense of imparting instruction or directing the mastery of skills, but to watch for the appearance of desirable interests, purposes, and "felt needs" on the part of the learner and, if they

appear, to suggest sources from which the learner may. if he wishes, get help in realizing them.

6. Systematic mastery through persistent application to a series of extended and integrated learning activities is justified only if the learner undertakes the arduous task of his own free will and then only if he sees clearly the end to be gained and the relation of the means to the end.

7. Moral controls are to be attained by a similar process. In general the growth must be from within. Imposed commands, even precepts and cautions, while admitted by the theory as necessary now and then to prevent immediate disaster, are at best necessary evils. The essential condition of all growth is freedom.

We are not concerned just now with either the inherent worth or the inherent validity of these tenets. Regardless of such questions, it is incontestable that these statements constitute a consistent summary of American educational theory followed to its logical conclusion. It is obvious also that a theory which yields logical conclusions of this sort fits admirably the demand for educational expansion. While it would seem from the theory that the responsibility for effort is placed upon the learner, in actual practice the learner is, in a quite real sense, relieved of responsibilities. The educational system — and particularly the teacher — must shoulder the entire load.

An attempt to realize the possibilities inherent in the upward expansion of American education will be a much better use of time and energy than will reactionary proposals looking toward a stemming of the tide. One may be justified in occasional pessimistic reflections anent the prominence of non-intellectual activities in college life and the prostitution of college opportunities to such personal ambitions as the itch to improve one's social status or the urge to make influential acquaintances. In so far, however, as these phenomena are anything more than surface currents, they lend emphasis to a far more fundamental defect: namely, the lack of thoroughness, system, and rigor which has come to characterize American education from the kindergarten to the university. The weakness of American education does not lie in the formalism which one group of reformers will always exaggerate; nor in the "dead wood" which another group would excise from the curriculum, usually with the aid of a butcher's cleaver; nor yet in the "regimentation" which still another group would break up — with dynamite if necessary. As a matter of fact, our schools have far less formalism, dead wood, and regimentation than have the schools of any other comparable nation. The real weakness of American education lies in what Professor Morrison has aptly termed "half-learning," and in the mental sloth and moral slackness which half-learning encourages. Such moral slackness may have nothing to do with conventional morality, of course, but it is none the less an unfortunate trait for education to propagate on a nation-wide scale. It is not at all impossible that this trait is responsible in part for the complacent attitude of the easy-going average citizen toward such unsavory phenomena as our unparalleled ratios of serious crime, the mounting divorce rates, and the wide prevalence of corruption in public office.

The flabbiness and superficiality of American education are due in part to the lack of adequately prepared teachers, not only in the elementary school but on the secondary and higher levels as well — a condition almost inevitable in view of the rapid growth of the high schools and colleges. With the slowing-down of the growth (which is already in evidence) this weakness in some measure will gradually be remedied; but only partially, unless a change of a more fundamental type is effected, for the influence of ill-prepared teachers is compounded, as we have seen, by an educational theory which,— with the very best of intentions,— has in reality condoned and sanctioned loose standards.

The large problem which American education faces may be simply stated: Can our schools and colleges "level up" rather than down? Can we realize the praiseworthy democratic ideal of equal educational opportunity for all without committing the American people to a standardized — an institutionalized — mediocrity? Can we maintain secondary schools that are quite unselective and higher institutions far less selective than those of other countries and still compete with other countries in the development of talent that will be competent to the higher realms of intellectual activity? Finally, throughout the range of school and college life, can we make the education of all an effective stimulus to intellectual and volitional growth upon the part of all?

The interesting experiments that have been undertaken in some of the colleges and universities to solve certain phases of this problem are well known and need not detain us here. They seem to be directed toward the provision of special opportunities for students of exceptional ability, promise, and ambition; but at the same time they recognize, at least by implication, the practical necessity of keeping the college doors still open to a relatively unselected group. One or more of these experiments may point the way toward a substantial advance in standards for those who are competent to meet highly rigorous requirements.

The more serious question, however, is whether a general stiffening of standards from the lowest to the highest levels of education is not only practicable but absolutely essential to even a modest realization of the possibilities inherent in the present situation. This does not mean, of course, that all should be expected to meet the same standards; such a hope would be so futile as to be foolish. It might well mean, however, a readjustment through which every individual would feel an increased stimulus to effort and hence to the intellectual growth that effort alone can bring about. This general forward movement along the entire educational front would in the end help the colleges far more than local advances in its own sector, important as the latter may prove to be.

There is sufficient evidence to warrant the conviction that not only the more competent groups but the average groups as well are working well below their capacities. In short, even for the masses, the standards are far below what might well be demanded without seriously affecting the retention of pupils and students. It is significant in this connection that achievement tests in the "fundamentals" standardized on the basis of the average attainments of our elementary school pupils have to be revised upward when used in classes of the same grade in Canadian schools; and one who compares the elementary schools of our country with those of western Europe cannot escape the conclusion that our results fall far short of what equally unselected groups in other countries find it possible to achieve in the way of accurate knowledge, adequate skills, and even dependable and dynamic ideals and attitudes.

The plain fact is that the relaxation of standards which made the upward expansion of education possible has been carried far beyond the measure essential to insure this end. Further than this, educational theory, which doubtless rendered a beneficial service in encouraging these relaxations, gave to the process so much momentum that loose standards have come in many quarters to be looked upon as virtues. This is clearly seen in the complete discrediting of the disciplinary ideal. There can be no doubt that the ideal needed revision, but the revision was carried so far as, in effect, to throw the baby out with the bath. A problem of the immediate future should be to rescue the infant and restore him to his proper place in both school and college; in fact, we are in a position now to see that an educational family without him is Hamlet with Hamlet omitted. He is essential — and I am confident that he will be healthier and stronger for the scrubbing that the reformers have given him. In any event, the indicated task of the educational theorist for the immediate future is to develop a New Discipline that will be able to compete successfully with the New Freedom.

In the future far more frequently than in the past, one may be certain, American education will be called upon to give an account of its stewardship. The unprecedented investment in schools and colleges may justly be expected to yield tangible returns of varied and valuable sorts. The increasing proportion of college-trained men and women in the adult population quite obviously should mean an increasingly powerful leaven of leadership toward better things. In the light of the present social situation and in the light of contrasts with other nations, one may venture to suggest certain fairly definite measures that may be employed in determining whether our ambitious program of higher education especially can be justified.

1. One should expect within the next generation a greatly increased productivity in the arts and the sciences. As reflected by such measures as the volume of published books in propor-

tion to the population and the annual *per capita* production of new books,[2] we are culturally still behind Great Britain and France and far behind Germany, although the past decade has recorded a gratifying increase, especially in publications of the more serious sort.

If Lester F. Ward was right in his contention that potential genius exists in far greater quantity than is commonly supposed, the upward expansion of mass education should discover genius and bring it to fruition on a scale heretofore unapproached. Such recognitions as the Nobel-prize awards should come with increasing frequency to American scientists and writers.[3]

2. One should expect a continuance and (shall we say?) a refinement and humanizing of our present leadership in commercial enterprise, financial management, and industrial organization,— the only fields, except mass education and skyscraper architecture, in which we seem to have an unquestioned leadership to-day.

3. With a larger number of trained leaders, and presumably a larger proportion of highly competent leaders, one should expect marked progress in the amelioration of social ills. The most generously schooled people in the world should not continue to have, among civilized nations, nearly the highest death rates from preventable causes. Even if we leave out the fatalities resulting from automobile accidents, the residual rates of accidental death are far above the total rates of other comparable countries, and while the average life span has been prolonged, we still have a higher rate of infant mortality than is general among enlightened peoples.

Quite as clearly, too, we should expect a progressive decrease in the ratios of serious crime. In most of the enlightened nations, the development of the universal school has been closely paralleled by falling crime curves. Our own country seems to be the most striking exception to this rule. If the most generously schooled nation in the world continues to tolerate a homicide rate double that of its nearest competitor (a relatively illiterate nation) and from four to twenty times the corresponding rates of other enlightened nations, a generous education policy and program will be hard to justify.

---

[2] See tables in *The Publishers Weekly*, Jan. 25, 1930, pp. 437ff.

[3] Of the 119 persons receiving Nobel prizes in physics, chemistry, medicine, and literature between 1901 and 1929, the United States is credited with five, Germany with thirty-one, France with seventeen, and England with sixteen.

4. Finally, with such leaders and such leadership, one should expect a marked advance in the standards that govern public life and the conduct of public affairs: a steady decrease in political corruption; an increasing tendency toward the rational consideration of our common problems; diminishing appeals to prejudice; diminishing evidences of religious and racial intolerance; a far more equitable distribution of wealth and of the comforts and opportunities that reasonably generous economic margins make possible.

In short, the justification of an educational system must be sought and should be found in unmistakable evidences of social progress. In the coming generation our adult population will have a proportion of college-trained men and women several times larger than any corresponding proportion in any other country. If this leaven exerts an influence upon our national life that is both positive and unequivocal, the American theory of higher education will have met successfully a fundamental test. We should not hope that the upward expansion of mass education will usher in a millennium, but we are justified in expecting definite and tangible and measurable progress, substantial in amount and unequivocal in character.

7

Ernest Martin Hopkins

ATTRIBUTES OF THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

7

ATTRIBUTES OF THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

Ernest Martin Hopkins

PRESIDENT OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

EDUCATION is a process by which civilization seeks to conserve its worth and to advance its standards. Among the agencies which have been established and perpetuated for promoting higher education, the college of liberal arts is of oldest lineage. Its method of affording advantage to the group we call society has been through the stimulation which its influence could extend to the growth of the individual. The measure of its value to-day is the extent to which such growth can be accelerated. Its opportunity for largely increased usefulness is dependent upon separation as complete as possible from the spirit of formalism or of institutionalism.

Almost inevitably, however, college administration and college instruction have become professionalized as few other activities in the world have become, for in the large the college community and the college procedure have not been subject to critical review of the world's appraisal until recently. Even now there is too much disposition to think of college work as being done for its intrinsic value rather than as a contribution to society. Thus, college establishments run the danger constantly of becoming too little sufficient for utilizing the rich opportunities which are theirs.

It would seem that while exercising all reasonable care not to become unduly iconoclastic the college would be most largely benefited which should most constantly subject itself to the test of attempting to answer a reiterated "why?" Upon the basis of conclusions thus formed, the college might face the future with added assurance that it could in increased degree anticipate and help to solve the problems of a rapidly developing civilization.

One who approaches the problems of the liberal college in such a spirit, however, is not unlikely to find himself in early difficulties, owing to lack of definitions and interpretations. Through constant effort, nevertheless, to supply these, progress may be made. Consequently, it is well, from time to time, that we should undertake to appraise the existent situation in regard to higher education and to such extent as may be possible to define and to clarify opportunities and obligations.

The scrutiny under which the American college of liberal arts has been placed since the World War has been to its incalculable advantage. Purposes have had to be reëxamined and objectives have had to be redefined. New considerations of method and of process have been made imperative. Clearer conceptions have been derived of what are the possibilities of accomplishment in institutions of higher learning. Likewise, the existence has become recognized of limitations beyond which the college of itself cannot go without interest and support of the public.

It is essential, for instance, that the public understand the differences in function of one type of institution and another in the field of higher education. There are numberless students on the thresholds of institutions of higher learning, and for that matter there are numberless parents of such youths, to whom no vital differences are discernible between one type of institution and another, not to mention the differences existent between institutions of like type. In America we use the word "college" as descriptive of a period and of a manner of education, following the secondary or preparatory school course. Within that classification, however, there are many subdivisions of type and many varieties of objectives characterizing different groups of institutions of higher learning.

The technical schools exist for teaching how to do specific things. These schools in the main have minor concern for such abstractions as speculative thinking to determine the social value of the thing done. Then, also, there are undergraduate departments wherein the courses are given over largely to vocational work. These tend to restrict the consideration of knowledge and the development of ideas within the specific limits of the vocational field for which these colleges give preparation. There are, also, arising now the junior colleges which proffer a greatly abbreviated course and will in time, doubtless, offer a short cut to the professional schools and graduate schools of some of our major universities. Finally, there are the colleges of liberal arts, still constituting the core of the American system of higher education and possessed of an inclusive field distinctively their own. It is reasonably clear what are the respective interests of the technical school, the vocational school, and the junior college; it is a little more difficult to define the purpose of the liberal college. Without attempt at too detailed classification, I shall use the term "American college" as synonymous with the "liberal arts college" or the "liberal college," which historically it is.

The American institution of higher learning which we call the liberal college accepts as its main objective the establishment of a habit of mind. It is interested in the wholeness of life and in all human thinking and in all human activity. Its consideration is given mainly to the common denominators which make for fullness of life rather than to exclusive interests which ignore vital phases of human existence. It is characterized as liberal because it recognizes no master to limit its right to seek knowledge and no boundaries beyond which it has not the right to search. Its primary concern is not with what men shall do but with what men shall be. The objective of the liberal college is to stimulate minds to activity in consideration of present-day problems, under restraint of lessons of the past and under spur of imagination of the possibilities of the future.

Mankind at large has never completely understood the civilization of its own time but interpretation has come most largely to generations whose prophets have been seers who have visualized the future through clear vision of the present and of the past. An individual or a generation which ignores its continuity with the past is incapable of understanding its relation to the present. Such a generation renders itself sterile for participating in the future.

The American college is an institution devised and developed for the needs of American life. It is beside the point to appraise its values in its own environment on the basis of its similarities or dissimilarities to educational institutions in other settings among other peoples. Its mission is the development and cultivation of an educated citizenry. Its origin was in the desire of the Puritan commonwealth for an educated ministry in the Christian churches. The tablet on the Johnston Gate at Harvard University carries quotation from contemporary records as to the purposes which led to the foundation of America's first college, in these words:

> After God had carried us safe to New England and we had builded our houses, provided necessaries for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God's worship, and settled the civil government, one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity, dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches when our present ministers shall lie in the dust.

The subsequent development of the American college was an expansion of this responsibility for a limited service to a responsibility to provide for educated members of the bar, educated physicians, educated engineers, educated business men. Now, within a decade, it has been called upon to educate a representative constituency for the good of the American people at large.

Meanwhile, also, the American college has come to be looked upon as an available and desirable agent for the developing of leaders within all realms of public and private affairs. Increasingly we have heard about the obligation of the college to develop intelligent leaderships for all of the various needs of contemporary life. This is justifiable if we interpret the term "leadership" sufficiently broadly. It is all wrong if we restrict its meaning to super-men. The gist of this matter cannot be better stated than it was in a baccalaureate address of President Birge of Wisconsin a few years ago, when he said:

Many writers to-day argue that colleges ought to select and train their students with a primary reference to leadership. I have never taken part in this discussion for I have been content that the University of Wisconsin should train its students to think and to work,— that it should fit them for public service arising out of work well done. If these results are attained, I have been ready to allow the question of leadership to be settled — as it usually is settled — by time and by nature. Yet in the sense that my words carry to-day, leadership is one of your social duties; it is also a duty for which you have been trained. I do not mean that you are to assume the direction of affairs; I am not talking about anything which will get your name into the newspapers, or you into the legislature. These results may come or they may not, and for most of you they are not likely to come. Your chief work for the public will be through inconspicuous service to your fellows. But in that service there is an element of leadership — often unconscious on the part of both leader and led — which every community, every state, must have if it is to be prosperous and happy. This is the leadership of those whose lives have been nourished from the great central sources of the world's life which the University possesses — from letters, from science, from knowledge applied to every side of life's activities. It is the leadership of those whose souls have been raised to a higher level by their years in the University, and who so live in after years that their neighbors are conscious of the fact. It is the leadership of those who in their turn direct the eyes of others to the light which the University can furnish, who extend the vivifying influence of the University to their own communities, who thus enrich the life of the state as they help to create the larger campus.

If it be asked why constantly there need be so much said about what the college is for and what it ought to do, reply must be made that it is because of the fact that conditions within the college and without the college are never the same in one time and another. Robert Louis Stevenson, in "Lay Morals," makes analogy between life and the shadow of a great oak. "The shadow," he says, "lies abroad upon the ground at noon, perfect, clear and stable, like the earth, but let a man set himself to mark out the boundary with cords and pegs and were he never so nimble and never so exact, what with the multiplicity of the leaves and the progression of the shadow, as it flees before the traveling sun, long ere he has made the circuit, the whole figure will have changed."

So it is with education. The accurately drawn figure of a given moment may be descriptive of little existent in the next.

The relation of shade to light alters continuously from year to year. It is consequently incumbent upon the college, from time to time, as frequently as possible, to examine the figure it has drawn of what education is and often to make revision of its concepts of what its own artistry must portray.

Always for the college there is the increasing task,— something to be added to that for which it has been responsible before. To-day it cannot lessen its emphasis upon the need for depth of knowledge, while asserting its increased extent, without stultifying itself. As well, it cannot betray the cause of the graduate school, which depends upon the college for preparation for specialization and research in restricted fields.

Yet, in our time as never before, the college must, in justice to the needs of society, emphasize the areas of knowledge, as well as its profundities. Particularly must it insist upon the importance of human experience in modifying doctrinaire hypothesis. Further, it must relate thinking to the realities of life. The possibilities of thought for thought's sake alone are soon exhausted. This notion is early to be consigned to the limbo of useless, if not degenerate, things. To-day, the world is handicapped even more by lack of men with sense of proportion and sense of the relationship of one phenomenon of life to another than it is by lack of men of erudition in specialized branches of knowledge. Ignorance of the relationships of knowledge may be found as evident and as dangerous among men learned in specialized fields as it can be found among those who are ignoramuses in all fields. The only available agent within our system of formalized education for giving thought to this condition and for making any effort to correct it is the American college.

Mankind is constantly misled and often has suffered grievously from its instinctive inclination to believe without proof that authorities in restricted fields of knowledge are wise in all. The great mind which functions with superb efficiency in the field of economic production, but generalizes fallaciously in regard to the uselessness and ineptitude of historical study, is no more astray from reality than may be the scholarly social scientist who condemns machine production, in disregard of its ultimate possibilities for adding to the comfort and to the happiness of society at large.

Count Keyserling has spoken upon this point in "The World in the Making." He says, "Because only the rarest among the gifted recognize their 'natural sphere of action,' and not because they might be too one-sided, do so few amount to anything in the history of humanity; in undertaking something more or something other than in them lies, they impair their own creative function, for the productivity of a faculty depends wholly on its proper adjustment to the core of personality and the surrounding world accessible to it."

In its interpretation of what education really owes to contemporaneous needs, the college must concern itself to-day with the limitations of specialized scholarship in interpreting the scope of knowledge. Furthermore, the time has come for us to say in our colleges what many of us acknowledge to ourselves, — that there is fully as much need for a constituency educated to choose its leaders as there is for educated leaders themselves. Particularly is this true if we hold democracy to be a desirable form of social organization, or if we believe in it as a form of government in political affairs.

Much speculation is given to the question whether we have in these times men as capable and as wise as were the leaders of old. If we are inclined to pessimism at this point let us in fairness recognize that the field of knowledge has so incredibly expanded and the intricacy of affairs has become so inconceivably involved that it requires men of deeper insight, wider intelligence, and more active imagination than ever before to render service of comparable significance in our day to that which was rendered in former times by leaders in the respective periods of accomplishment.

If we conceive of leadership in terms of power, we are not lacking evidence in contemporary life that in individual men this quality still persists and that authority for prolonged periods can be seized and held and exercised by a Mussolini or a Lenin. If we hold leadership to be influence that wins affectionate confidence and fires the imagination of men, we have for contemplation the figure of a Gandhi with a greater personal following than any man has ever had in his own lifetime in the world's history.

In distinction from these, we have among all peoples other men of discriminating judgment, intellectual power, and spiritual conviction, who have all the potentiality needful to great leadership but whose very greatness holds them from seeking it or seizing it. Meanwhile, ignorant or irresponsible constituencies withhold conferring it upon them. One trouble with representative government is that it is too representative! It is not so much qualities of leadership in individual men that the world lacks to-day as it is the intelligence, the desire, and the will of the public that leadership shall be intrusted to these.

It seems clear that we must distrust the validity of much that has been said in regard to its being the function of higher education to train for leadership. We must revise this statement to say that the first function of the college is to educate men for usefulness.

For more than a century, mankind has been accepting more widely each day the principle that the voice of the people is the voice of God. This has resulted in an undiscriminating confidence in the infallible worth of public opinion in regard to any specific issue. We maintain the forms of delegated responsibility but in practical operation we demand that our legislators, our courts, our churches, and our schools shall be subject to the popular will of the time, however ephemeral or capricious this may be. Practically, and acknowledgedly, that man is held to be a more eligible candidate for high position who has done little, good or bad, than is the man who has done much, if some of this has been contrary to the popular will, as it must inevitably have been.

It is trite to repeat the statement that man's growing mastery over the material world has so far outstripped his knowledge of the laws of human relationship, or, indeed, his desire to know these, that progress in the latter realm is infinitesimal as compared with advance in the former. It is worthy of more than idle consideration, indeed, whether man's enlarged dominion in the fields of physics and chemistry has not introduced a hazard to the social state beyond his political ability to control. With man's escape from the domination and repression of the church in the search for scientific knowledge, the way was opened for an unprecedented advance in knowledge of natural laws and for the utilization of these in accordance with his desires. Man, however, has not escaped, nor in the present temper of the public mind is he likely to be released, from attempted domination by conventional minds of his thinking, his speech, or his deeds.

The influences to restrict and to suppress thought or experimental action on the part of those who would be pioneers in the field of social or political relations are as marked, on the one hand, as, on the other, is the encouragement for and endorsement of experimental research in the fields of science. In the large, mankind is not possessed of any desire for light or guidance as to how it may discover truth in regard to theory or practice essential to improved conditions in human relationships. Men are almost as little willing to allow consideration and discussion of how possible safeguards may be erected against future catastrophe.

Meanwhile, throughout society, mutual suspicions and mutual distrusts establish what amount to professional types of mind whose affiliations preclude clear reasoning. Men adopt attitudes and take positions on current issues not so much in recognition of the merits of the specific questions involved as in accordance with the prevailing thought of their respective economic, intellectual or social castes. Thus, the world comes to be filled with people with causes to defend or with theses to maintain, regardless of facts pertaining to the individual case. Those desirous of light to reveal what causes are worth defending or what projects are worth espousing are few in proportion to those who resent evidence which conflicts with opinions they already hold, whether from belief, prejudice, or instinct, or the dictates of self-interest.

The influence of a liberal college education ought to be such that men should desire as complete knowledge in regard to the merits of what they do not believe as in regard to those opinions which they hold as convictions. Mutual respect between men of conflicting views ought not to be notable by its complete absence among men to whom opportunity has been offered for mental cultivation. If something of forcefulness were lost, a more than compensating gain in reasonableness would be secured. The possibility, under such conditions, that occasionally a man would be led to change his mind ought not to be held by him or by the community as dangerous to self-respect or antagonistic to the public welfare.

Macaulay, in his essay on "The Earl of Chatham," speaks of the characteristics of the Whig and the Tory, each "as the representative of a great principle, essential to the welfare of nations. One is, in an especial manner, the guardian of liberty, and the other, of order. One is the moving power, and the other the steadying power of the state. One is the sail, without which society would make no progress, the other the ballast, without which there would be small safety in the tempest."

For any familiar with sailing, who have been rendered helpless in a calm or brought near to catastrophe in a storm, the analogy will not require elaboration. In any helpful theories of social progress we must respect the values of sail and ballast, alike. If it seems to some of us that the ship of social welfare is in danger of being overdressed with sail, the arguments for attention to the need of ballast must needs deserve careful investigation. If to others of us it seems that in the imperatively desirable voyage to some safe harbor, time is the essence, the argument for further spread of sail should not be lightly disregarded.

Surely, among educated men it ought not to be held that all merit, except in most infrequent circumstance, will be found wholly in one attitude or another. This is the quality of the spirit of tolerance which the American college should crave in its men, not that they should lightly abandon conviction and belief, but that they should be willing to examine the validity of their beliefs in the light of all possible data bearing upon these. Meanwhile, it is to be added that the man with a positive belief, even if a fallacious one, is better than the man without any. Forcefulness has the possibility of becoming intelligent and useful. For passiveness there is little use or hope.

At this point we come inevitably to the question of authority. The weakening of the respect for authority may well be held to be the greatest problem of the present era. Few would argue, even among the extreme malcontents, that all authority can be dispensed with and civilization still be preserved. The unceasing quest among men of intelligence is for the place where authority may be found and for knowledge of the attributes by which it may be recognized.

If all of our thinking is not to end in futility and if all our works are not to be in vain, we must arrive speedily at some working hypothesis, generally accepted, however much it may be held subject to eventual correction. Otherwise, we must end in anarchy and chaos and destruction, and become a generation known for its destructive genius without capacity for constructive thought or coöperative action.

Prince Andre Lobanow-Rostovsky not long ago pointed out in an article in *The Hibbert Journal* that authority derived its power for countless centuries from the assumption that it was derived from the Source of Supreme Authority on High and was bespoken through His representatives on earth. "God became more distant and invisible, but the rulers acted and spoke in His name and were considered responsible to Him for their rule."

Prince Rostovsky proceeds to point out that though definitely dead now, the idea stood the test of seventeen centuries of the Christian era, as well as the many thousand years of the pre-Christian civilization.

He concludes,—

> We find, therefore, at the opening of the twentieth century, humanity drifting into a period of cyclonic changes and revolutions and the crisis of authority, from lack of a solid transcendental basis, has become a crisis of civilization.
>
> What will be the outcome of this deadly disease? A diversion to the old idea of "God in Heaven, King on Earth," is impossible owing to the weakening of religious faith in the masses. The absolute grip over souls that it had a few hundred years ago and its domination in matters secular have vanished presumably forever. Loose and slovenly democracies with noisy elections bringing to power men who have no qualifications except skillfulness in electoral tactics, will probably be eliminated by the very force of things, by more disciplined and concentrated communities, whether civilized or barbaric.

* * *

If it is impossible to forecast, still it is the first duty of every thoughtful mind which has witnessed within the last fifteen years a nearly total collapse of civilization, to scrutinize the problem with the utmost penetration. One may say with certainty that the very life of Europe depends on whether or not out of the present turmoil there will be evolved a conception of authority sufficiently stable to assure the continuity of its development, and broad enough to embrace all modifications of thought and custom which progress will present. The problem offers two aspects: First, the designation of the proper men to exercise power; and, secondly, the endowing of their authority with sufficient moral backing to make it effective.

Herein lies one of the greatest questions of all time. Has our generation an answer? Can education help? What have the men of our colleges to say?

In this connection college teachers and students need to avoid the hazard of a too professionalized point of view. This is that in arguing the need for a sharpened critical faculty among men and a more rigorous attempt to subject all the phenomena of life to a rule of reason, we do not make extravagant and unjustified claims for what rationalization is capable of in explaining life or in determining action.

After the maudlin sentimentality and the simpering emotionalism widely prevalent in the Victorian era, it was as inevitable as it was desirable that reaction should set in and that we should approach the realities of life with less posing and more genuineness. It was likewise natural that this process should be particularly emphasized within our colleges, even perhaps until all enthusiasms should be dulled, all emotions scorned, and all aspirations weakened, when these could not be clearly shown to be sponsored by the intellect. This development, however, has clearly passed the point of its greatest usefulness. Now, in turn, the colleges should be the first to accept and to proclaim this fact.

When the intelligently planned and courageously executed pioneer flight of a modest private citizen from New York to Paris can stir friendly emotions and create international good will toward the United States to an extent greater than provincial legislative attitudes can destroy; and when more completely than diplomacy could do it, a great people are rehabilitated in the world's interest and respect by appealing to the world's imagination through dramatic accomplishments such as those of a *Bremen* or a *Graf Zeppelin*, it would seem that the time had come to concede that dour rationalization is not all of life.

Professor Sumner has enunciated a fundamental truth in "Folkways" that our colleges sometimes ignore: "Book learning is addressed to the intellect, not to the feelings, but the feelings are the spring of action."

The American college was conceived and established by men deeply imbued with the spirit of self-sacrifice and permeated with a sense of responsibility for enhancing the public welfare. The gifts of material resources and the consecration of personal careers to college service through centuries since have been inspired by like motives. It has been for the sake of influencing the body politic through men eager for the public good, as well as through men intellectually competent, that colleges have been founded and have been sustained during lives of increasing strength. The student or the officer of the college who ignores this fact or resists response to the "feeling" of an institution is misplaced within its ranks.

Hence, the college has responsibility to cultivate the feelings as well as the minds of its membership. Its atmosphere is as important as its curriculum. The careers and accomplishments of its graduates will be affected not alone, nor perhaps most largely, by specific knowledge which they have acquired. Their disposition toward life, so far as college influence goes, will be determined by the extent to which their feelings have been refined and tinged with sense of responsibility during undergraduate years. Herein lie the incentives to action and the wellsprings of inspiration among college men.

In spite of the dangers of generalization, I, with deliberation, make this one. If the only options available to the American college were to graduate men of the highest brilliancy intellectually, without interest in the welfare of mankind at large, or to graduate men of less mental competence, possessed of aspirations which we call spiritual and motives which we call good, I would choose for any specific college the latter alternative. And in doing so, I should be confident that such college would create the greater values and render the more essential service to the civilization whose handmaid it was.

Lecky, the great expounder of rationalism, discussing the limitations of reason, says, toward the close of his "History of Rationalism in Europe": "Utility is perhaps the highest motive to which reason can attain. The sacrifice of enjoyments and the endurance of sufferings become rational only when some compensating advantage can be accepted. The conduct of that Turkish atheist who, believing that death was an eternal sleep, refused at the stake to utter the recantation which would save his life, replying to every remonstrance, 'Although there is no recompense to be looked for, yet the love of truth constraineth me to die in its defense,' in the eye of reason is an inconceivable folly; and it is only by appealing to a far higher faculty that it appears in its true light as one of the loftiest forms of virtue. It is from the moral or religious faculty alone that we obtain the conception of the purely disinterested. This is indeed the noblest thing we possess, the celestial spark that is within us, the impress of the divine image, the principle of every heroism. Where it is not developed, the civilization, however high may be its general average, is maimed and mutilated."

Perhaps the American college most completely justifies itself as liberal when it gives most attentive ear to the scriptural injunction, "Yea, with all that thou hast gotten get understanding." Understanding requires that the history of custom be as much a matter of interest as the history of thought, that "how we get that way" in prejudices and partisanships be examined as carefully as how we arrive at opinions and convictions, that the motivation of feelings be not ignored when we are weighing the possibilities of pure reason. We should not fall into easy misconceptions of what the American college of liberal arts wishes to accomplish or of the significance of the processes by which it works.

Nevertheless, the liberal college must accept responsibility, while remaining acutely conscious of all else it ought to do, for meeting its all-essential obligation to enlarge the areas of the mind which shall be accessible to college men. It must seek to be a stimulus to intellectual awakening and heightened mental power. It must aspire to be an agency by which men may be induced to think. It must cajole ability, not to flatter it but to give it self-confidence. It must flay ignorance, not in contempt for those condemned to it but in solicitude for those who may avoid it. It must question conventionality, not because convention is predominantly wrong but because convention is not always right. It must challenge belief, not that belief shall be destroyed but that it shall be made strong.

The American college was in its origin an instrument of higher education devised to meet particular needs of a pioneer people. Consonant with this spirit in its foundation, it has evolved, developed, and diversified itself in accordance with the rapidly changing organization of society in America from one method to another and in conformity with one environment and another until the present time. It was fashioned largely at first, as would naturally have been the case, on the model of the English colleges. Later, it was greatly influenced by the ideals of German scholarship and the methods of German universities. Throughout its history, however, it has been *sui generis*, like the people whom it serves, and it has been characterized by elements of strength and weakness such as have characterized this people. So it is to-day!

Restricted oftentimes in the realization of its aspirations by fallacious conceptions of what constitutes democracy, it has retained its idealism; repressed frequently by forces which sought to make it their agent, it has retained its freedom; attacked persistently as radical, when it has declared its independence of conventionalities, and denounced as supine, when it has refused to ally itself with extremists, it has remained independent. Operating in recent years between barrages of criticism from within and uncomprehending complaint from without, its strength has yet grown and the breadth of its appeal has constantly widened.

To-day, the American college has prestige, influence, intellectual vitality and consequent potentialities far beyond those which have been evident in any former time. Moreover, it has increasingly the openness of mind, the sense of responsibility, and the determination to utilize its opportunities and to render its desirable service. Its major obligation still is to human society and its principal solicitude is that civilization continuingly shall benefit from the absorption into itself of individuals who through contacts with the college become better and wiser and more competent and more coöperative than they would otherwise have been.

8

George Edgar Vincent

THE INEVITABLENESS OF SELECTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

8

THE INEVITABLENESS OF SELECTION IN HIGHER EDUCATION[1]

George Edgar Vincent

FROM 1917-1929 PRESIDENT OF THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION, NEW YORK
[FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA]

THE biologists tell us that members of a human society, if classified according to physical, mental, and moral characteristics, fall roughly into three categories: a great central or mediocre group which includes about 95 per cent of the population, a small upper stratum of superior, exceptionally able people, and at the other extreme another small class of the inefficient, the criminal, the undesirable, the so-called degenerates who fall away from the genus. It is further pointed out that each of these groups does not often reproduce its kind biologically, but that, for example, superior parents may and do have mediocre or inferior offspring and vice versa. A significant fact is that a large majority of the members of the two extreme classes arise from parents of the mediocre class.[2]

These biological facts have obviously an immediate bearing on educational policy for a democracy. It is necessary to provide a general education for the central mediocre many because of their rôle in the formation of opinion and the decision of issues, and because among them superior individuals will be born and given opportunity for development.

---

[1] Based upon Addresses delivered at the University of California at Los Angeles, March 28, 1930, and at the University of Virginia, April 12, 1930.
[2] Jennings: *The Biological Basis of Human Nature,* pp. 31 and 32.

It is equally, if not more, essential that the exceptional few be discovered and educated in the best possible way, because in them are to be found the imagination, initiative, energy and resourcefulness by which alone problems are to be solved and readjustments made. It is the gifted few who insure what in America is so confidently called progress, often less hopefully known in Britain as "muddling through."

The idea of education for the many fits perfectly into the traditional faith in democracy and is in tune with the phrases about "equality," "opportunity for all," "natural rights," "the great heart of the people," "you cannot fool all the people all the time." But the idea of selection is distinctly unpopular. It seems to smack of aristocracy and privilege. It is resented by the average man, embedded somewhere in the center of the wide zone of mediocrity, that typical individual supplied by this group with shibboleths and ready-made conversation, that human phonograph who plays the social records, who in the words of Stevenson "never by any happy accident says the unexpected thing." He is indignant at the mention of an *élite* and is likely to invoke the name of Jefferson to whom are attributed no end of radical notions about the meaning and methods of a democratic régime.

As a matter of fact Jefferson thought of democracy in a quite different fashion. He wanted to see a population of white, rural landowners with a stake in the country, responding intelligently to the leadership of a few able, well-educated men whom the voters had the good sense to elect as law-makers and governors. He believed that things would be better managed in this way than by the domination of a wealthy, hereditary, selfish aristocracy. He trusted the kind of "people" who owned property, lived in the open country, and had time to think. He opposed industry and commerce for a long time, largely because he feared that towns and cities would create wage-earning crowds that could be easily swayed by demagogues.

That Jefferson had no fanatically equalitarian ideas about education is clearly proved by his proposed Bill for the General Diffusion of Knowledge. This presupposed an educational pyramid, broadly based for the large body of citizens, but culminating in a small apex for a rigidly selected few. He insisted upon finding and developing a true *élite* — Adams induced him to use the word *aristoi* — youth of "genius and virtue." It was to them that he looked for imagination, initiative, and problem solving. He had no illusions about the capacity of the many for spontaneous thought or purpose. But in a vital respect Jefferson's philosophy was genuinely and consistently democratic. The capable few were to be sought not alone in hereditary or wealthy groups, but in all parts of the population. To guard against economic and social selection full scholarships — not merely tuition fees — for needy youths of promise were to be provided at public expense. It is noteworthy that in formulating this plan Jefferson emphasized the young men's value to society, not their natural right to an advanced education.

Ample evidence on this point is to be found in a recent volume by a French author who thus characterizes Jefferson's philosophy of selective education: "Is this a democratic view in a modern sense of the word? At any rate, it is not the democratic phraseology of a democratic politician. There is no protest at all in the name of immanent justice against the inequality of conditions, there is no desire to give every boy a fair chance in life, no indication that, all men being born equal, all children should have equal opportunities." "We are perfectly free to believe," he continues, "that Jefferson entertained such sentiments at that date. Historically, however, there is no evidence that he did so. All we have here is a hard-headed proposition with the corrective that, under the new system, a child of genius or great talent was to be given an opportunity to develop his native qualities, for it was both the duty and interest of society to prevent such a waste of intellectual potentialities." [3]

Jefferson's ideals were at least approximated during the century which followed. A free public school system spread throughout the nation. Higher education was provided in numerous denominational colleges, a few of which gradually took on some of the features of universities. State institutions for professional and liberal training were created. Opportunities for young men and women of limited means to attend these public and private foundations were multiplied. But the processes of economic and social selection were at work. The numbers who sought advanced training were a small percentage of the whole.

---

[3] Chinard: *Thomas Jefferson, the Apostle of Americanism*, p. 96.

Then toward the end of the nineteenth century, with an increase in national income, a movement began which was to gain a remarkable momentum in the next two decades. Public high schools, which were to be hailed as "people's colleges," increased in number, introduced diversified curricula, and secured elaborate buildings and equipment; consolidated rural schools began to appear; a system of private preparatory and finishing schools took on new life and developed rapidly; the State Universities made notable progress and the privately endowed establishments gained substantially in resources and strengthened their departments, especially their graduate and professional schools. Research was more and more put forward as a true university function. This astonishing expansion was for the most part in response to the increased number of students who sought admission to colleges and universities. It was the beginning of a "boom" period in which numbers were a source of satisfaction and pride, an era of quantity production, hailed in certain quarters as a triumph of democracy. Selection was dipping deeper and deeper into the upper levels of the 95 per cent of mediocrity.

With the War came a brief check, then followed the deluge. Students poured in so rapidly that many institutions were almost overwhelmed. It looked as though the United States were about to offer higher education to everybody. Was the educational triangle to become a parallelogram? Suddenly selection had become a crucial problem in the United States. To be sure, the post-war flood of undergraduates seems to have reached its highest point. It probably will not recede; it is likely to hold its present relative level for a considerable time. Even so, no other of the leading nations undertakes to give advanced training to so large a proportion of its youth. In foreign lands aspirants are weeded out by methods of elimination which seem almost ruthless. Social status, economic pressure, limitation of opportunities and rigid tests of ability keep the numbers well below — in most cases far below — the percentages which prevail in the United States.

Here the social prestige and advantages of college life, a vocational purpose, the ambitions of parents, the competitive spirit, the attractions of the campus, the lure of athletic fame have powerfully reënforced, if not often obscured or supplanted, a genuine intellectual interest, the desire for a fuller and richer personal life, and the determination to be useful to one's fellows as motives for seeking a higher education. The selective processes have clearly been inefficient. Their defects are not far to seek. The more obvious of them are: inadequacy and leniency both in the tests for admission and in standards applied afterwards; the existence of State systems of sometimes almost automatic progress from kindergarten to university; the competition of institutions for numbers; the provision of generous funds for needy students; the feeling that democracy somehow should give every one a chance without being too exacting about real ability and probable value to society. The public dearly likes to believe that most sons of rich men are privileged persons "studying to be morons," but the idea that many youths endowed with little besides a pathetic ambition, who are trying to work their way through college by waiting on table or tending furnaces, are biologically better fitted for trade-schools or factories than for laboratory or library is too intolerable to be even momentarily harbored by a candidate for office.

At last a natural reaction has set in. Questions of policy, costs and consequences are raised. Is there danger of confusing the two tasks of general education for the many and of special advanced development for the exceptional few? Are the biological laws being ignored? Can even so rich a country as the United States find the funds to spend on so many who come from the mediocre group of the nation? Are teachers of the right sort likely to be available in sufficient numbers? Does not biology insist that in a real sense first-class teachers are born and not made? Is there, moreover, danger of turning out large numbers who cannot be content and happy in the positions which their natural abilities, however camouflaged by instruction, will in most cases force them to fill? In recognition of the lengths to which things have gone and of the need for action, new phrases — always a preliminary stage to doing something — are being minted and put in circulation, for example: "quality not quantity," "a better not a bigger Yale," "the search for exceptional students," "not individual desire but usefulness to society."

The motto of several institutions has become *verba et opera*. Various methods of selection are being put in force. Limitation of numbers, long applied in medical schools of high rank, is being slowly extended to other professional schools and even in a few cases to colleges and the undergraduate classes of universities. This restriction, even though it is still enforced by rather mechanical and inflexible devices, raises perceptibly the quality of the student groups. With the gradual introduction of more individual and resourceful methods, especially with insistence on a really significant personal interview with every candidate, the student body will take on more and more the character of a true *élite*, selected not for one trait but for desirable combinations of various qualities, among which intellectual capacity will, of course, always be a primary consideration.

Even without the stimulus of limitation, it is possible to make entrance requirements more exacting and to hold students to higher standards after admission. This policy is being adopted by many privately supported institutions as well as by the leading state universities. This applies particularly to the professional schools of the latter. It is not hard to convince the public that to prevent the turning out of incompetent or unscrupulous doctors and dentists is much more important than giving stupid, clumsy and irresponsible men and women a chance to exploit their fellows. The same idea is being extended to the training of lawyers and to some extent to teachers, but it is hard to make the average person agree that the principle should cover those who are supposed to be acquiring a liberal education.

The increase of tuition fees has a bearing upon selection in so far as it deters mediocre persons on the border line from trying to enter college. On the other hand, it compels a similar but slightly higher type of the rich or well-to-do to make a substantial payment toward the cost of his education. The obvious danger is that youths of first-rate ability and character may be excluded. It was against this risk that Jefferson insisted that provision should be made. When it comes to dealing not with poor and worthy students of industrious mediocrity but with young men and women without means but of unquestioned capacity and unusual personality, society can well afford to guarantee not merely free tuition but graded forms of aid up to and including full support. To handicap such students with exacting outside work is a mistaken and wasteful policy. Lend them funds if it seems best, but let them be unhampered in devoting themselves to the development of their powers to the utmost.

There are two consequences of more careful selection which are noteworthy. Students of a higher type demand better trained, more resourceful and stimulating teachers. The competition of institutions for such men and women tends to raise the salary level and to evoke other inducements which will, it is to be hoped, draw people of a better grade into the career of college teaching. It has been suggested by an amiable cynic that if the lazy and stupid students were thrown wholly into the hands of the dull and unimaginative pedants of the staff, the two groups might bore one another into a willingness to abandon the whole undertaking and thus further promote the cause of selection. There is another consequence of raising the level of the student body. Keen and ambitious undergraduates demand more freedom and responsibility in self-directed work. They resent the limitations of a highly artificial and formal system of courses, prerequisites, majors, minors, groups and the like. An instruction factory, created for dealing with large quantities of miscellaneous material shoveled into the entrance hopper, is grotesquely unfitted for dealing with alert, automotive young men and women who are genuinely interested in making the most of their capacities.

So it comes about that experiments of many kinds are being made to test the possibilities of giving larger freedom to students who have shown ability to profit by it. The preceptorial system at Princeton, "honors" courses, notably at Swarthmore and Dartmouth, the House Plan at Harvard and the new Quadrangles at Yale, are all significant attempts to find exceptional individuals and to give them special opportunities as well as to increase the dignity of scholarly pursuits. In the words of President Lowell the new House Plan "is merely designed to make the intellectual life respectable in Cambridge." It is too early to appraise with any finality these different experiments. It is fortunate that a variety of plans is being tested. A premature standardization of methods would be most unfortunate as would be the attempt to transplant unchanged the tutorial systems which have grown up in the older English universities. The important thing is that selection of students and large freedom in self-education are gaining recognition as sound policies. Methods of applying these principles in accordance with American conditions and needs will gradually be worked out.

The doctrine of selection is unpopular not only in the community at large, but in certain other circles as well. To relieve the apprehensions of the joyous majority of students who merely "go to college" and are relatively free from the handicap of intellectual interests, and of those adolescent alumni who oppose any change, especially if it seems to threaten athletic prowess, it should be said that the policy of selection is not likely soon to leave academic halls solely to a small number of anæmic and ascetic pedants. Quite obviously a predominant interest in exceptional or outstanding students implies the continued presence of a fairly large delegation from the upper levels of mediocrity, as a background from which the former may stand out. No, the proposal is not annually to decimate the student ranks, but gradually by selection to raise the general level and to provide special opportunities for the intellectually serious and capable few. It is a shift of emphasis from preoccupation with "lame ducks" to the stimulating and guiding of the gifted and ambitious. This will in time affect the whole tone of academic life, and may stir up able but dormant loafers.

There is a form of selection at work which raises vital issues. Medicine, law, business and other vocations are selecting a fairly high type in the leading universities and are making large demands for improved professional training. The heavy costs for professional schools and the tendency to make the undergraduate course more and more pre-professional are in danger of undermining and weakening in staff and resources the fundamental subjects, mathematics, the natural sciences, the social sciences, and what for lack of a better name we call the humanities. One consequence is the discrediting in large measure of the idea of a liberal education. It is insisted that the enormous mass of accumulated and tested knowledge makes specialization inevitable. The most that an educated man can hope to do is to master a small field and gain intelligence enough to select authorities in other subjects and accept their expert guidance. In this view the idea of giving large numbers a general orientation to life and of finding a few capable of peculiar insight, imagination and innovating power becomes vague, slightly sentimental and increasingly futile. A vista opens up in which one sees only specialists, each with his own separate knowledge with no one trying to put it all together into a whole which shall have meaning, ends and incentives.

This outlook is so gloomy that it seems imperative not to give up the idea of a liberal education as at least a background for inevitable specialization. Here again there is hope in selection and the changes which must follow its adoption. The fundamental fields will gradually be opened in a new spirit to eager undergraduates. Subjects and departments will become means, not ends. Problems on the departmental border lines will engage attention. Details will be organized into ever larger and more significant wholes. It must be admitted that mathematics and science have been too often unimaginatively presented; pedantry and gerund-grinding have many a time made the classics dreary; history and political science have frequently seemed factual and arid; sociology, miscellaneous and wordy; philosophy and ethics, abstract and desiccated; æsthetics, vague and sentimental; but after all it is these studies which, under illuminating and inspiring guidance, are sources of exquisite mental pleasure, of sensitiveness to truth and beauty. They may kindle the imagination, create in the mind a panorama of history, give a sense of informed and well-poised patriotism, some grasp of international relations;

they may stir to high purpose and awaken reverence and awe.

In the graduate school another form of selection is being forced to attention. As things stand the degree of Doctor of Philosophy has become largely a teaching certificate, not an evidence of research ability. The time is at hand when the two functions will be recognized as different although having certain important relations. Reorganization is bound to follow the differentiation of graduate study into teacher training on the one hand and the development of a relatively small number of genuine investigators on the other. It is even possible that the former function will be transferred to the university Colleges of Education which will also offer opportunities for observation of undergraduate teaching, especially in the new forms which are being introduced. The recruiting of promising undergraduates for training as investigators will be increasingly a result of the changes which are under way. More careful selection, "honors" courses, the introduction of research problems and methods, encouragement of initiative and responsibility, will help to "throw out a dragnet" for the exceptional few.

The stress which has been laid upon selection of the outstanding few must not lead us to ignore the rôle of the mediocre many. The higher the level of information and the power to use it among this vast group and the greater their respect for intellectual attainments, the better is the chance of discovering individuals of unusual ability, of securing for them opportunities for development and of inducing them to adopt careers in which their exceptional talents and character will be utilized in the highest degree for the common good. An attitude of patronizing superiority or of contempt for the many and the repetition of scornful phrases about democracy such as "the cult of incompetence," "the passionate pursuit of the second-rate," "the apotheosis of mediocrity," may be a source of pleasure to the cynical, but yields no light and leading. It is the part of wisdom to remember that in a democratic society two things must ever be kept in mind. One is the providing of the many with the techniques of communication, some working ideas of nature and society, a sense of the national tradition, standards of social conduct, some capacity for scrutinizing suggestion, some power to select experts, some appreciation of intellectual and esthetic pleasure. The other essential task is to discover and give opportunity for the socially loyal development and special training of the inevitably small number of exceptionally able persons in whose imagination, initiative, energy and compelling personalities the most effective leadership will be found. In the past, perhaps naturally enough, much stress has been laid on the first task. Now, attention has turned more definitely toward the second. Selection is always at work, for the most part unconsciously, in every human society. Selection is emerging as a more definite aim in American education. It has come to stay as one of its guiding policies.

9

Irving Babbitt

HUMANISTIC VERSUS HUMANITARIAN IDEALS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

9

HUMANISTIC VERSUS HUMANITARIAN IDEALS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION[1]

Irving Babbitt

PROFESSOR OF FRENCH LITERATURE AT HARVARD UNIVERSITY

IT WOULD be reassuring if one could establish a connection between the late President Eliot's educational theory and his character and personality.[2] His character and personality would seem, however, to derive from the Puritan tradition at its best, whereas his theory at the essential point marks an extreme recoil from Puritanism. This essential point is his attitude toward the problem of evil. The genuine Puritan has a lively and even exaggerated sense of the "Old Adam"; President Eliot, for his part, scarcely allows at all for a law of the members. The current mode is to disparage Puritanism because of its undue repressiveness and at the same time to overlook how much it repressed that actually needs repression. One may maintain, indeed, that it would not have been easy for President Eliot to take so idyllic a view of human nature if Puritanism had done its work less effectively. There is in general a danger that one may take to be a spontaneous emanation of the natural man what is in reality the result of generations of religious or humanistic discipline. The illusion of President Eliot is that of a man who, himself born to great riches, deems it "natural" that every one should have cash in the bank.

---

[1] Reprinted with slight changes from the January 1929 edition of *The Forum;* used with permission of the editor of *The Forum*. The original title of the essay was: *President Eliot and American Education.*

[2] The reader should keep in mind that I am dealing in this essay with only one aspect, though in my judgment, the most important aspect, of President Eliot's influence on American tendencies in higher education. My conclusions, if I were discussing his rôle in the development of an American University—for example, of the Harvard Medical School—would be far more favorable.

This illusion is, to be sure, one that he shared with many others. It is markedly present in no less a thinker than Emerson. Emerson, however, transcended his time in important particulars, whereas President Eliot did little more than reflect the time in its main tendency. For forty years he pushed American education in the direction in which it was already leaning. His whole career, indeed, illustrates the advantages of going with one's age quite apart from the question whither it is going.

If, however, one is finally to be accounted a great and wise leader, it is not enough thus to be the faithful servant of the wisdom of an age; one must also be true to the wisdom of the ages. The question whether President Eliot deserves this latter praise should, if it is to be discussed in a way worthy of him, be lifted above the petty and the personal into the region of ideas: this means practically to consider the value of the naturalistic philosophy that he and other leaders of the nineteenth century espoused so heartily.

This philosophy culminates in a doctrine of progress that would seem to be in serious conflict with the wisdom of the ages; for it is plain that there can be no such wisdom without the assumption in some form of a core of normal human experience that is set above the shifting tides of circumstance. The progress proclaimed by the naturalists, on the contrary, is to be achieved not by transcending the phenomenal flux but by a surrender to it. As Tennyson exclaimed in his most Victorian moment:

> Forward, forward let us range!
> Let the great world spin forever down the ringing grooves of change.

The belief in progress in its most naïve form is still held by multitudes, especially in America. It may be doubted, however, whether in the future any one of a distinction comparable to that of President Eliot will be able to hold it with the same bland confidence. It has been receiving the most formidable of refutations — that of the facts. The contrast between the whole conception of a "far-off divine event" and incidents like the Great War is too flagrant.

The humanitarian idealism based on the faith in progress will be found on analysis to be either utilitarian or sentimental. Practically, in education as elsewhere, a utilitarian and sentimental movement has been displacing traditions that are either religious or humanistic. President Eliot deserves to rank as our chief humanitarian idealist in the educational field, not because of any novelty in his views, but because of the consistency and unwavering conviction with which he applied them. As a matter of fact, his views are anticipated on the utilitarian side by a writer like Locke in his *Thoughts on Education*, and on both the utilitarian and the sentimental side by Rousseau, whose *Emile* has become, if not in its specific recommendations, at least in its general spirit, the Bible of the modern educator.

Superficially, at least, humanitarianism is even more triumphant to-day than it was during the lifetime of President Eliot. Humanitarians are at present shaping our educational policy from the elementary grades to the university. One should, however, note in passing a curious circumstance: the most thorough-going humanitarians — for example, our professors of pedagogy and sociology — are held in almost universal suspicion in academic circles and are not infrequently looked upon by their colleagues as downright charlatans.

What would seem especially desirable in dealing with the whole situation is a critical clarification — in other words, an attempt to penetrate beneath its surface to first principles. For example, President Eliot's attack in the name of the elective system on the traditional college curriculum will be found, when thus probed to the bottom, to involve a clash between a familiar type of naturalistic philosophy and the wisdom of the ages; for nothing is more certain than that this wisdom has been neither utilitarian nor sentimental, but either religious or humanistic. In exhibiting the nature of this clash it would seem well to avoid, as far as possible, dogmatic affirmation and to proceed positively, and in the sound sense of the word, psychologically. What a survey of the past actually reveals is that considerable groups of men have at various times and in various places got together on certain fundamentals — have, in short, worked out conventions. These conventions have constituted the spiritual climate, as it were, of whole historical periods. Most men in these periods no more thought of questioning the convention under which they lived than they did the very air they breathed.

Those who assert that there is no permanent core of human experience set above mere historical processes would have a stronger case if it could be shown that the main conventions that have prevailed in the past are hopelessly at odds with one another. These conventions are, to be sure, all very much implicated in the local and the relative. Yet if one considers them from the point of view of the fruits at which they aimed in life and conduct, one cannot help being struck by certain important agreements. One may illustrate almost at random from the two chief religious conventions that have obtained respectively in the East and the West — the Buddhist and the Christian.

About the middle of the third century before Christ, Asoka, the Buddhist ruler of India, had carved on rocks and pillars at various points throughout his vast empire recommendations to practice certain virtues. These virtues will be found to be nearly or quite identical with those enumerated by Saint Paul as the fruits of religion: “Love, joy, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faith, mildness, self-control.” Chinese, again, who know the Confucian books — the main source of the humanism of the Far East — are struck at once by the substantial accord between these books and the *Ethics* of Aristotle, perhaps the most authoritative single document in the humanistic tradition of the Occident.

Moreover, one may discover an important agreement not only between different forms of humanism but between humanism and religion — the assumption, namely, that man needs to be disciplined in his natural self to some standard; that he needs, in short, in the almost literal sense of the term to undergo conversion. Though conversion always involves a facing about or turning away from the natural man, it may be conceived very differently. The Augustinian Christian, for example, conceives of it somewhat melodramatically as brought about by a sudden irruption of divine grace. For the Aristotelian, on the other hand, it is to be accomplished rather by the gradual formation from childhood of right habits. In all its forms, however, conversion implies an opposition in the heart of the individual between the expansive desires and a principle of control.

The exercise of this principle of control requires the putting forth of a special quality of effort or will. What I have termed "the wisdom of the ages" is, in short, primarily concerned with the problems of the inner life, and in its attitude toward these problems it is dualistic. The activity that it promotes is on the religious level summed up in the word meditation. Genuine meditation involves a subordination of the natural man to a higher will — humility, in short, a word that in the present naturalistic era has almost lost its true meaning. The subordination to the higher will may, as in the more austere forms of Christianity, amount to a renunciation of the desires of the natural man. The humanist, on the other hand, is satisfied with imposing on these desires a law of measure or decorum. His program may be summed up in the word mediation.

Religion and humanism not only come together in the idea of conversion but one must add that, if the humanist is not to run the risk of sinking to the naturalistic level, his mediation needs to have a certain background in meditation. One is forced finally to agree, if only on psychological grounds, with Burke that "humility is the low but deep foundation of all true virtue." It does not follow that one must accept the thesis developed by Mr. T. S. Eliot in a recent issue of *The Forum* that humanism is something precarious and parasitical and that, for occidental man in particular, it is doomed to speedy collapse unless it has the support of dogmatic and revealed religion. The most important manifestation of humanism that the world has yet seen — that in ancient Greece — did not have any such support.

One cannot admit, moreover, that humanism must necessarily derive from Greece any more than one can admit that Christianity has had a monopoly of religion. In these days of universal and facile communication and of an ever-increasing closeness of material contact, it is important to do justice to the achievements — religious and humanistic — of the Far East. The tendency of M. Henri Massis, for example, in his *Defense of the West,* to discover no effective source of humanistic or religious wisdom outside of the Roman Catholic Church, is due in part to sectarian narrowness, in part to sheer ignorance of the facts. The reasons why the occidental should normally associate his humanism and religion with the traditions that go back to Rome and Greece and Judæa, though extremely cogent, are a matter of expediency rather than of first principles. In direct proportion as one develops the critical temper, one is forced to base one's convictions, not primarily on any tradition, but on the immediate data of consciousness.

Let us inquire, as far as possible in this critical fashion, why the religious and humanistic teachers of the past have been so concerned with the exercise of the principle of control and in general with the problems of the inner life. Perhaps one may best reply to this query by bringing together three sentences of Aristotle, a thinker who will be found to be more completely experimental than many moderns who profess to found their whole philosophy on experiment. The three sentences are as follows: "The end is the chief thing of all"; "The end of ends is happiness"; "Happiness is a kind of working."

Aristotle has himself admonished us to give heed to the sayings of the wise men of old only in so far as they are found to coincide with the facts. If, therefore, we attach weight to Aristotle, it should not be primarily because of his traditional authority, but because Aristotle turns out to be only another name for inspired good sense.

It would seem, indeed, that if a man deals honestly with himself, he must grant that no concern can be nearer to him than that of his own happiness. Aristotle's treatment of happiness is especially relevant to our present topic because of the close connection he establishes between it and his scheme of education. An education, he says, deserves to be accounted liberal only in so far as it culminates in the idea of leisure. The idea requires that all partial aims and special disciplines should be subordinated to the specifically human form of effort or "energy" — the source of true felicity — that is put forth in mediation and finally in the contemplative life or life of vision.

With this background in mind one should be able to grasp the nature of the conflict between the wisdom of the ages and the humanitarian "idealism" of President Eliot. Like the religious and humanistic teachers of the past, President Eliot was very much and rightly preoccupied with the problem of happiness. Like these teachers, again, he held that to be happy one needs to be active and energetic. But in his notion of the kind of activity that tends to happiness he plainly diverged from these teachers widely. According to a French authority, "happiness is not an easy matter: it is difficult to find it in ourselves and impossible to find it elsewhere." President Eliot must be numbered among those who hoped to find it "elsewhere." In the addresses given on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday, he advised his hearers to avoid introspection, to "look out and not in" (one gathers from the context that he identified introspection with the morbid brooding of the introvert). The counsel he proceeds to give seems superficially the same as that carved on stone many centuries ago by the Buddhist Asoka: "Let all joy be in effort." "Let small and great exert themselves."

The effort that President Eliot recommends, however, is outer effort — effort of the utilitarian type. The primary concern of Asoka, on the other hand, was with inner effort — the kind that is put forth in meditation. President Eliot has of course, here as elsewhere, the merit of being highly representative. The main effort of the Occident was in his day, and still remains, in ours, utilitarian. If any one thinks that utilitarian effort is going to lead to the fruits that Asoka and Saint Paul associate with religion, he would seem to have, even more than the English country curate to whom this trait has been attributed, "a large and easy swallow."

We are here, at all events, at the parting of the ways. If one is convinced of the essential rightness of President Eliot's idea of effort, one may continue to believe that we are now moving in America toward some glorious consummation of the kind postulated by the nineteenth century doctrine of progress. Otherwise one may rather incline to believe that we are ripening for Nemesis; for Nemesis is the penalty visited upon spiritual blindness. Blindness to the need of a form of effort radically different from that of the utilitarian would seem to be rather serious.

The crucial assumption of President Eliot appears to be that the material efficiency promoted by utilitarian effort will be used altruistically. For the traditional attempt to train for culture and character he sought to substitute, in his own phrase, "training for service and power." Power is in itself desirable provided it be employed to some adequate end. The whole issue is whether service in the humanitarian sense can supply this end. Most Americans are convinced that it not only can but does. Service has been made the basis of the gospel of Rotary and may therefore be termed our Rotarian convention.

However thoroughly we may be persuaded of the admirableness of this convention, it is well for us to keep in mind that it has been accepted only to a very limited extent by the rest of the world. In general, foreigners incline to see in our idealism, so far as it is of the humanitarian type, either hypocrisy or self-deception — usually the former. The opinion is almost universal abroad that, in our relations with other countries in particular, we are altruistic in our feelings about ourselves and imperialistic in our practice. An increasing minority of Americans are also beginning to question the "religion of service," to maintain that it is only a varnish for commercialism, and that the varnish is wearing thin.

The word service, it should be noted, has changed its meaning in the transition from Christianity to humanitarianism. In general, the representatives of the utilitarian-sentimental movement have tended, by a tampering with general terms, to dissimulate from others and perhaps from themselves the wideness of the gap between the new dispensation and the old. I choose almost at random as an example of the tendency the following advertisement of one of our life insurance companies: "Buddha, who was born a prince, gave up his name, succession, and his heritage to attain security. But we do not have to give up the world; we have only to see a life insurance agent who can sell us security for the future, the most direct step to serenity of mind." The issue raised by this advertisement touches Christianity at least as closely as it does Buddhism. The "serenity" and "security" at which both religions aim are scarcely of the kind that we may purchase from the agent of a life insurance company. The net result of this transfer of the language of religion to an entirely different order has been, from the point of view of the wisdom of the ages, to encourage an extraordinarily complacent materialism.

The alteration in the meaning of the word service in particular — the substitution of the service of man for the traditional service of God — has been important in its influence on education, because it has meant practically a more or less complete elimination of the idea of conversion. The Christian had based this idea on the dogma of original sin. The form given to this dogma by Puritans like Jonathan Edwards is no doubt highly objectionable. Unfortunately, President Eliot and the humanitarians have, in their rejection of the dogma, laid themselves open to the suspicion of pouring out the baby with the bath. Not merely Puritanism but every doctrine that asserts the dual nature of man must be felt, in its relation to man's natural self, as more or less repressive.

For this repression President Eliot wished to substitute full and free expression. The elective system, which he sponsored, tends to identify the ideal needs of the individual with the mere unfolding of his temperament and idiosyncrasy. Every youth, it is assumed, has some innate gift — a gift which is treated with almost religious seriousness, and is therefore to suffer no contradiction. The effort that he puts forth along the lines of his temperamental bias will make for his own happiness and finally be pressed into the service of humanity. Aristotle evidently had in mind a different type of effort based on a different conception of happiness when he declared: "We ought also to take into consideration our own natural bias, which varies in each man's case, and will be ascertained from the pleasure and pain arising in us. Furthermore, we should force ourselves off in the contrary direction, because we shall find ourselves in the mean after we have removed ourselves far from the wrong side, exactly as men do in straightening out a crooked stick."

What proof is there, after all, that so purely temperamental a person as President Eliot's theory tends to produce will be altruistic? The humanitarian is finally forced to fall back on some theory of man's natural goodness of the kind that is commonly associated with Rousseau, but which was anticipated in England by the third Earl of Shaftesbury. According to Shaftesbury, the unconverted man is not egoistic, as religion has traditionally maintained. On the contrary, he has an instinctive affection for his fellows — a will to service, as one may say.

The theory has undergone surprisingly little modification from Shaftesbury's day to this. For example, Professor John Dewey, who has probably had more influence than any other living American on education, not merely in this country but in the new China, writes that "the child is born with a *natural* desire to give out, to do, to *serve*" (my italics). Let any one who has growing children observe them closely and decide for himself whether they exude spontaneously this eagerness for service. Let him then supplement this observation by a survey of the working of the theory on the larger scale for several generations past. He may conclude that the amount of instinctive goodness released by the decline of religious and humanistic control has been somewhat exaggerated. He may fail to find evidence that a human nature that is neither meditative nor again mediatory, that has in short dispensed with humility and decorum, is likely to prove idyllic.

The unduly idyllic hopes of the humanitarian throw light on the quality of his imagination — an important point to determine in any one's outlook on life. President Eliot was much preoccupied with the whole question. "The training of the imagination," he says rightly, "is far the most important part of education." It can be shown not only that the quality of his own imagination was idyllic rather than ethical, but that this fact accounts for his attitude toward the problem of evil of which I spoke at the outset. He asks us to discriminate between two forms of imagination — the constructive and the receptive. He further subdivides the constructive imagination according as its constructiveness is operative in literature or in physical science. He proceeds to contrast the imaginative construction of a Dante or a Zola, where everything is gloom and disharmony, with the imaginative construction of the man of science, as displayed, for instance, in a modern power plant, where everything is accurate, orderly, and beneficent. President Eliot evidently regarded those writers who are concerned with the element of evil in man as morose theorists rather than as hard-headed observers of the facts. One may also note in passing that he seems unaware of the incommensurable gap separating Dante's treatment of evil from Zola's.

As examples of the receptive imagination, he paints a picture of a young woman poring unprofitably over the scenes in which Thackeray portrays the "malign motives and unclean soul of Becky Sharp," and then opposes to this picture that of another young woman who spends her time observing "two robins who have established their home and family in a notch of a maple near her window" and in learning from their ways with their young lessons of unselfishness and affection. One scarcely need insist on the idyllic and sentimental view of both nature and human nature that is implied in such a contrast.

President Eliot's whole treatment of the imagination — for example, his assertion that Darwin and Pasteur have by their imaginative activity done as much to satisfy the "spiritual needs" of man as Dante, Goethe, or Shakespeare — is already "dated." As the nineteenth century, with its own special atmosphere, recedes still further into the background, the "idealism" that he and other men of his time sought to erect on naturalistic foundations is likely to appear positively fantastic. What becomes of the beneficence of the control over the forces of nature that has been secured with the aid of the scientific imagination, should it turn out that in the unconverted man — the man whose impulses are free to overflow — the will to power overflows even more freely than the will to service? The Great War has enlightened us on this point.

Once grant that the humanitarian hypothesis has broken down at the center and the alternative would seem to be to revive in some form the dualistic conception, to reaffirm once more that the individual needs in the interest of his own happiness to submit to some sound discipline of his outgoing desires, to put aside, in the phrase of Buddha, the ignoble for the noble craving. "The universal thirst for the enjoyments of life," says President Eliot, "grows hotter and hotter and is not assuaged." In that case, one might suppose, it is urgent that this thirst be moderated with reference to some correct scale of values. On the contrary, President Eliot makes his observation part of a plea for the putting of political economy on a level with the traditional humanities.

Political economy, for its part, will be found in all its forms — orthodox and unorthodox — to have accepted the humanitarian substitutes for the principle of control. As a result of this substitution, it is still under the suspicion of being the "dismal science." The political economist looks askance at any limitation of desires on the part of the individual, envisaged primarily as a consumer, lest such a limitation should lead to a slowing down of production. Production is apparently to expand indefinitely — a program that has been summed up in the formula: "Pigs for more pigs for more pigs." One is reminded of this program by the articles Henry Ford recently contributed to *The Forum*. One may be sure that he would not have set forth his philosophy of industry so confidently — one is tempted to add so naïvely — were it not for the presence in the background of really dignified figures, like President Eliot, who are at one with him on certain underlying postulates.

The discrediting of the principle of control in favor of a sheer expansiveness is in general dubious. In the educational field it is not only dubious, but, so far as it leads to a primary emphasis on innate gifts and their supposed right to expand freely, it is also Utopian. Any one whose business it has been to advise college undergraduates will testify that, as a rule, they are not conscious of having any such gifts. They are determined most frequently in the choice of their life work by chance or necessity, and then become interested in this work in the very process of performing it. To be sure, an occasional student has, or seems to have, some inborn aptitude. It goes without saying that the humanist does not seek to thwart such aptitudes. He does, however, insist that its possessor needs supplementary training if he is not to become a lop-sided specialist.

On his initial assumption that most students have instinctive bents that they are eager to follow, President Eliot bases the further assumption that effort does not need to be stimulated, as it was in the older education, by competition. His assertion that "lazy students are more likely to get roused from their lethargy under an elective system than under a required" is not confirmed by realistic observation. If the average student to-day is more interested in football than in things of the mind, one reason may be that football, unlike the college as it has become under the new education, has a definite goal and is frankly competitive with reference to it.

It is estimated that about three-quarters of a million students are now enrolled in our institutions of higher learning, more than in all other countries combined. At the same time the very idea of liberal education is in danger of perishing in America in the midst of a great bewilderment. It would not be fair to make President Eliot alone responsible for this confusion. His exaltation of the variable over the constant elements in human nature, has, however, been a contributing factor. "Every youth of eighteen is," he says, "an infinitely complex organization the duplicate of which neither does nor ever will exist." This dangerous half-truth, when made the foundation of a system of education, is simply incompatible with the survival of religious and humanistic standards.

We seem to be witnessing to-day the consequences of a weakening of standards. According to M. André Siegfried, we are making a ruthless sacrifice of the higher cultural values to mass production and material efficiency. According to Mr. Charles Merz, in his good-natured satire, *The Great American Band Wagon*, the spectacle offered by contemporary America is that of a multitude of essentially trivial people rushing restlessly from one inconsequential fad to another. Such pictures are no doubt one-sided, but that there is in America a drift toward standardized mediocrity is indubitable. It is also indubitable that our education as a whole is not supplying the proper corrective.

How many of our college graduates, for example, are capable of leisure in the Aristotelian sense? It is notorious that the psychology of these graduates in their moments of release from merely vocational activity is indistinguishable from that of the tired business man; nay more, the psychology of college and university teachers themselves, including teachers of the traditional humanities, is, when they are not working as specialists, likely to be that of the tired business man. In the absence of humane purpose, what has triumphed is the purpose of the utilitarian. A multitude of specialties, all viewed very much on the same level, has taken the place not only of the selection of studies in the old curriculum but of the selective principle itself. Education has become increasingly miscellaneous and encyclopedic.

The momentous nature of the change from the old to the new has been dissimulated under the blanket degree. This dissimulation has amounted at times to virtual dishonesty. A man wishes to enjoy the prestige of the traditional A. B. while dodging the discipline that this degree has traditionally represented. He wishes, for example, to elect a course on "The killing, trussing, and marketing of fowl" (I quote from the catalogue of one of our state institutions) and at the same time to pass as liberally educated.

Comparatively few Americans are likely to share the doubts I have been expressing about the humanitarian revolution in the theory and practice of education. The idea of service proclaimed by President Eliot and put at the basis of our Rotarian convention has not as yet been seriously shaken. Nevertheless there are signs that the utilitarian-sentimental movement has passed its crest even in America. An increasing number of persons are feeling disquiet at the sapping of the sense of moral responsibility by the sentimentalists. Others still more numerous are beginning to see that the utilitarian idea of effort is one-sided and that, as a result of this one-sidedness, modern life is in danger of degenerating into a wild rush one knows not whither. The complaint is in fact growing fairly common that "things are in the saddle," that we are being mechanized both outwardly in our acts and inwardly in our minds — that we are, in short, in a way to become "robots." Even a Sherwood Anderson has enough wit to perceive that all is not well with the present standardized America.

Unfortunately, laments about the evils of standardization are not, unless supported by a sound constructive program, of much avail. If all that is needed is to scoff at the Rotarian convention and the "religion of service," writers like Mr. Mencken and Mr. Sinclair Lewis would seem to meet every requirement. These writers can be shown, however, to be a part of the very malady they are assailing. This malady may be defined as a refusal to recognize any norm or human law that acts restrictively on the free expansion of temperament.

Any one who has made a study of the modern movement from the eighteenth century down will finally become convinced of the futility of a merely temperamental insurrection against convention. Whether the temperamentalist be of the soft or sentimental variety, or, like Mr. Mencken and his followers, of the hard or Nietzschean brand, is comparatively immaterial. The objection to the Rotarian convention is not that it is a convention — that is rather its strength — but that a dubious element has been built into its foundation: namely, an idea of service that does not seem a sufficient counterpoise to the "lusts" of the natural man. In the language of religion, the Rotarian hopes to achieve salvation without conversion.

The effective opposition to the Rotarian is likely to come, not from Bohemians, each flying off on his own temperamental tangent, but from persons who are getting together on an entirely different basis, who see that the pathway of escape from standardization is not through ideals as currently conceived, but through standards, and that to get standards one will need to insist on the specifically human elements in man that have been eliminated by the naturalists. How complete this elimination has been may be seen in practically all forms of recent psychology. The behaviorists in particular, with Mr. J. B. Watson at their head, are in this matter sinking to depths previously unplumbed.

The person who refuses to accept pseudo-science or any other substitute for standards still has to decide whether he is to secure his standards in a critical or a purely traditional way. The Roman Catholic, for example, gets his standards in this latter way. If any one desires to proceed more critically, he will then be confronted with what is known in Platonic language as the problem of the One and the Many. He will, in other words, have to choose between a surrender to the naturalistic flux and the assertion of a something in man that transcends it.

Periods of more or less complete emancipation from the past, which therefore have to get their standards, if at all, in terms of the One and the Many, have always proved crucial. There is evidence that we have already reached this crucial stage in our own development, and that we are taking the wrong turning. Pragmatism — the philosophy with which America has come to be associated in the eyes of the world — is from either a religious or a humanistic point of view, raw and uncivilized. The difficulty with the pragmatist is not his preference for what works, but his one-sided notion of working — his failure to take account of the form of working that is, according to Aristotle, necessary if one is to achieve happiness. The reason why this one-sidedness should prevail in America more than elsewhere is obvious. The utilitarian form of effort has been especially needful in our conquest of a continent. Having developed in fullest measure the virtues of the pioneer, we are now in danger of becoming the victims of them.

We should, however, be careful not to exaggerate the gap in this respect between America and other countries. Other countries are now lamenting the evils of "Americanism" and at the same time getting themselves Americanized as fast as they conveniently can. It may be that if there is to be any effective reaction from Americanism it will have to come from America itself. We cannot allege as an excuse for the utilitarian excess, as various other countries can with some plausibility, the pressure of economic necessity. So far as economic conditions are concerned, we are free to develop the idea of leisure, as something distinct from either idleness or recreation, to show ourselves the "people of action" in a sense quite different from that given to the phrase by the utilitarians. The idea of leisure is in itself so important that if we did develop it adequately we might be in a position to assume the cultural leadership of the world. It is depressing that we are showing so little grasp of the situation, that our higher education in particular, so far from aiming to produce the man of leisure, is being more and more completely dominated by the "ideals" of the humanitarian.

I have said that if one is to achieve standards in opposition to these ideals — at least in a modern and critical fashion — one will have to face finally the philosophical problem of the One and the Many. It should be added, however, that quite apart from the solution of this difficult problem, common sense will go far in uncovering the defects of the new education and in devising a remedy. There is probably even now a minority of shrewd observers who are ready to get together on a basis different from that of the reigning educational convention, to give adequate support to at least a few institutions of learning that are in their underlying spirit humanistic rather than humanitarian. It is just at this point that it may be possible to resist successfully the stupid drift toward standardization.

The question should be of special interest to the smaller colleges. With these colleges sound educational practice may be found to coincide with self-interest. The new education requires an enormously elaborate and expensive apparatus. This elaborateness is encouraged by the prime emphasis of the utilitarian on the progress of humanity through the coöperation of a multitude of specialists, as well as by the prime emphasis of the sentimentalist on innate gifts and their right to gratification. The small college that accepts the department-store conception of education, is at once put at a hopeless disadvantage. The humanistic college, on the other hand, even though its needs can no longer be fitly symbolized by Mark Hopkins at the end of the traditional log, may hope to flourish with a much more modest equipment.

Most of the heads of our institutions of learning, great and small, have been content for a generation and more to follow in the wake of President Eliot. The present need seems to be for educational leaders whose first aim is quality — quality in the teaching body, quality in the students, above all, quality in the subjects taught. The college must substitute selection for encyclopedic inclusiveness if it is to have a definite goal and concomitantly to witness a wholesome revival of the spirit of emulation. It is not to be supposed, however, that the reasons why certain subjects deserve to be preferred to others in a scheme of liberal training are arbitrary in the sense that the rules of football are more or less arbitary. These reasons are on the contrary deeply rooted in the facts of history and human nature.

At the bottom of the whole educational debate, as I have been trying to show, is the opposition between a religious-humanistic and a utilitarian-sentimental philosophy. This opposition, involving as its does first principles, is not subject to compromise or mediation. Those who attempt such mediation are not humanists but Laodiceans. Many persons who deem themselves moderate are in fact only muddled. Hence the need I have already pointed out of critical clarification. The discriminations I have been attempting will not be in vain if even a few are led thereby to abandon the Laodicean attitude and to take sides on issues that involve finally the future of American civilization. It will be found to be no small matter whether our higher education is to have enshrined at its center the idea of leisure in Aristotle's sense, or the idea of service in the sense given to the word by President Eliot and the humanitarians.

10

Paul Arthur Schilpp

THE MOST CRITICAL FAILURE OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

10

THE MOST CRITICAL FAILURE OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

Paul Arthur Schilpp

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY AND CHAIRMAN OF THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF THE PACIFIC

THE American college[1] is failing at the most critical points of its task. This is a tremendously serious charge. It is, therefore, the primary purpose of the present essay to establish the truth of this contention beyond the possibility of much serious doubt or question. One could wish most sincerely that to do so were not so easy. But facts, and not the wish, shall dominate this discussion.

Let me first state and discuss what I consider to be the primary task and function of the American college, and also give my reasons for this consideration.

The education, whether primary, secondary, or "higher," of no country can be either understood or rightfully evaluated aside from an understanding of the specific peculiarities and consequent needs of the respective country and age. To understand, then, the primary task and function of the American college necessitates a comprehension of this college in its setting in the United States of to-day.

---

[1] I realize, of course, that there is no such thing as "the American college" *in concreto*. Yet the term I consider well chosen for what I do mean to express thereby, namely the *average* college or the general run of colleges in the United States of America to-day. There are, obviously, notable exceptions among American colleges; but these exceptions merely cause the usual type of college to stand out the more boldly.

There are two factors which, more than any others, characterize and make the contemporary American scene. One of these is a fact, the other is more nearly an idea than a fact. I refer, of course, to the fact, in the first place, that the United States — more than any other country on the face of the globe to-day — stands in the sign of the machine, and, in the second place, to the idea, in one form or other dominating our outlook and action in practically every direction, of democracy, and of democratic institutions and behavior. These two factors provide the essential setting for the American college to-day and it is they, therefore, which must be considered to set the task for our institutions of learning.[2]

If we take a brief look, in turn, at each of these two factors we find that the machine-age has brought revolutionary changes into American life. Millions of men, who used to work twelve and fourteen hours per day and six or even seven days per week, now find themselves tied to productive labor for only eight (and in some cases six or even fewer) hours per day and from five to five and a half or six days per week. Nor does this mean either that they are producing less or that their income has been diminished. The fact is, production has been tremendously increased as a result of the coming of the machine, and wages — while they may not have increased in proportion to the increase in production — have been sufficiently advanced to make the laboring man of to-day much more independent and comfort-, yes even luxury-enjoying than was the worker of yesterday; and that in spite of the fact of the enormous reduction in the average number of working hours per week.[3] These combined facts — viz., fewer hours of work per day, fewer days of labor per week, and yet more actual money to spend — have brought something to the life of practically every worker in the United States to-day which other countries and even our own country in previous generations could give to only a privileged few — namely, leisure time. Now it is by no means obvious that the possession of leisure time is an unqualified good for every or any indeterminate possessor. For everything depends, after all, upon the way in which this leisure time is used. For many a man excessive amounts of leisure time have spelled ruin. And many another, who does not realize that ruin may be reached in some other fashion besides drinking one's self to death or gambling all of one's possessions away, has gone to an equally certain doom by idling away excessive amounts of leisure time in a perfectly useless if not indeed definitely harmful fashion. That this is no longer a mere hypothetical state of affairs may be seen by the vast number of people, wage-earners and others as well, who hardly ever miss a day in attending a movie or a talkie. And there are many even who attend during one day two or more of these often inane or even questionable and indecent entertainments. This is, of course, only one among a thousand different ways of wasting and idling away perfectly good leisure time.

---

[2] There would seem to be no sense in making a point for point comparison of one educational system in one country with that of another country; for the educational systems, standards, and methods of each country must be judged in the light of the respective country's educational needs, purposes, and tasks; and these latter can be determined only by the peculiar situation and specific ideals of each respective country. American education, therefore, must be judged in terms of American needs and aspirations, and not in any specious comparisons with the educational systems, standards, and methods of any other country. This fact, however, must not be misinterpreted to mean that comparisons of systems, standards and methods is not legitimate. Only such comparisons, if made without regard for national needs or ideals, can never tell the true story.

Nor must it be forgotten that the use which is made of this ever-increasing amount of leisure time is all the more important because of the fact that the machine has also taken away much of the former difficulty attending most types of work, and also nearly all of the element of creative endeavor and the consequent interest in completed achievement and in the final enjoyment of it. That is to say, even while the average laborer of to-day is at work, in nine cases out of ten he is simply going through a routine performance which, while it may be harder on his mind because of its more or less deadening effect, does certainly not require the hard and difficult labor to which he was formerly accustomed. Thus he is physically less fatigued when the hour strikes which marks the beginning of his leisure time. But far more damaging to his life and character is the fact that, while formerly he was often himself a real creator and consequently had the interest of personal delight in the actual progress of the work and of joyous satisfaction in the completed task, he now usually feels himself as not much more than a cog in the wheel, who, while his work is essential to the total product, simply can neither get vitally interested in what he is doing from moment to moment and hour to hour nor get any real or personal satisfaction out of the completed product of the combined labor of all his fellow-workmen, in all of whom he is likely to be as little interested as he is in his labor. This is a tremendous liability. Yet it is not of such nature that it could not be more than overbalanced by the triple fact of his newly gained leisure time, his comparative freshness at the close of his working day, and the consequently large use he could make, for creative and cultural purposes, of this newly released time and energy. But here comes the problem. How is this man going to be able to invest his leisure time wisely, usefully, and intelligently, unless he has been trained for such use by having been given a real foundation for things and activities which are truly worth while, and by having developed a real personal interest in them? And this problem, exasperating in itself, has been increased by the relatively new independence and freedom of women, who have crowded into many industrial, business, and professional occupations and consequently have tremendously swelled the army of those who, every day of their lives, have many hours of leisure time.

---

[3] This must not be taken to mean that I consider the coming of the machine as an unqualified boon. I am well aware of the fact that this same machine has thrown thousands of productive workers out of work and has caused the terrible unemployment situations which constitute one of the major internal problems of almost all of the occidental countries at the present time. But this essay is not concerned with all of the economic consequences of the machine-age; but merely with those which have direct bearing upon the problem of the purpose and function of higher education in the United States.

The other factor which plays such a dominant rôle in the life of present-day America is the idea of democracy. Let it be admitted at once that the framers and writers of our two historically most sacred documents, i.e., the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, had everything else in mind except starting a government based on anything like mob-rule. And let it be granted, moreover, that no thinking or sane person to-day wants anything of that nature. Yet it cannot be denied that, in the sense of the admission of every one's right to a fair chance at the benefits and comforts of life, the idea of democracy, or, to put it perhaps more precisely, the democratic ideal has taken such complete and practically self-evident possession of the mind of North America that every one of our institutions finds itself shaped and determined by this ideal. I am not saying that it is always consciously present, and far less that it is ever perfectly carried out or even modestly successful. But I am asserting that it has become so much a part of us that in no direction can we quite escape its power and influence, even if we should like to do so. However, we are so steeped in this spirit and attitude that it is very unlikely that any sufficiently large group is even questioning it, much less thinking of changing it. Nor am I, at any rate in the present essay, at all concerned with the question of the merits or demerits of democracy or of the democratic ideal. I am simply stating what I think is a demonstrated and demonstrable fact that our whole social, economic, and national life in the United States cannot be understood or explained aside from the powerful influence of this democratic ideal.

In the realm of education this ideal has obvious and far-reaching effects. In the first place it has committed us to the unalterable pursuit of the principle of universal education, meaning that not only shall every child in America have the opportunity of getting an education, but that, up to a certain point, every American child *must* subject itself to one or another of our educational institutions. So far so good. But it is perfectly obvious that we cannot rest satisfied with this. A country of democratic ideals must make educational pursuits possible to any one of its citizens and visitors to the very limits of the individual's intellectual capacities. To do less than that would be to be fundamentally untrue to the basic principles of democracy.

However, even this is not enough. The democratic ideal cannot content itself with providing educational institutions for the training of the individual's mental capacities to their highest possible development. It must, if it would be true to itself, in addition insist that the largest possible number of its citizens *shall* avail themselves of all educational facilities of the country to the limits of their mental capacities. For the democratic ideal demands that educational institutions, even those of the higher type, shall not exist for the training of a mere select class or even of outstanding leaders in the nation's various affairs, but for the training in intelligent understanding of as many of its citizens as can be made to avail themselves of these opportunities. This, of course, is the principle underlying the rapid and phenomenal development of our state universities, entrance to which cannot be denied to any student who is a resident of the respective state and who comes ready to show that he is — not mentally qualified, but — institutionally prepared; that is to say, who can show that he is a graduate of an accredited high school. Surely, it can readily be seen, that any attempt even at carrying our democratic principles in government and other affairs of life cannot demand less than the highest possible educational development of all citizens to the end of creating not merely highly trained leaders of the democracy but a widely trained and educated, and consequently thoughtful and understanding, citizenry which is the only worthy guarantee of the possibility and maintenance of a democracy which is something more than mere blind and unintelligent mob-rule. In other words, the more truly democratic the management of the business and affairs of the nation and the more intelligent that management is desired to be, the more the nation will have to insist on the highest possible education of the largest possible number of all its citizens.

What, then, in the light of this particular setting of the American scene, is the primary task and function of the American college?

To the writer, at least, the answer to this question appears to be fairly self-evident. That is to say, with the definite exception of graduate and professional schools, the higher education of a country committed on the one hand to the principle of democracy and on the other to the benefits, because of the increasing provision of leisure time, of the machine-age, must increasingly come to be education for the wise, useful, and intelligent use of leisure time. For, regardless of how well we may train the average citizen for his particular economic task, or train the leader in the various professions of the democracy for his specific profession, unless we can educate as nearly as possible all of them to an intelligent understanding of all, or at least most, of the various great problems confronting the life of a more or less democratic society in its multitudinous directions, we shall indeed have failed at the most pivotal point of our experiment in democracy. And unless the educational opportunities provided by our democratic ideal shall lay a definite foundation and arouse a vital and growing interest in students for things of the mind — of art, and of culture — the increasing amount of leisure time with which the onward march of the machine-age is providing most of us, so far from saving us or being a boon to us, may yet spell our inevitable doom.

Thus the primary task and function especially of the American college of liberal arts in our day is that of preparing the largest possible number of our citizens for a wise and intelligent use of their leisure time.

This, I maintain, can be accomplished only if the college of liberal arts does two things: first, it must provide its students with a sufficient fund of facts, of principles, and of knowledge in the various fields of our contemporary life and interests so that the student will feel some sort of familiarity with each one of these various fields and interests; and, second, it must present its material in all, or at least in enough, of these fields in such a way as to arouse the vital interest of the individual student in the respective subjects and fields. For only by doing *both* of these things for its students can the college insure to its graduates the wise and intelligent use of their leisure time in later life. The college graduate who has developed a living interest in history and political science, in economics and sociology, in music and literature, in philosophy or mathematics, in natural science or some form of graphic art, and an insatiable hunger for them during his college career will never find himself at a loss as to how to spend his leisure time in later life, regardless of what his occupation or profession may happen to be. Nor will he blindly or unintelligently face any of the burning questions of the day, be they questions of economic, of political, of international, of moral, of literary, or of any other character. All such problems will be grist for his mill, they will whet his appetite for life, and for active participation in the modern world's most crucial problems. He will not only be able intelligently to discuss these problems with other equally well-trained men, but even with experts in these various fields. Thus he will not only feel himself quite at home in his world but ready actively to take part in the world's work, and that not merely within the exceedingly limited realm of his major profession or occupation. If to-day's American college of liberal arts fails in these things, then it will have to be pronounced a failure in its primary and most important task. It may succeed in other matters, but such success can in no wise compensate for defeat at the point where our present economic situation and national ideal demand success at almost any price if the nation with its ideal of democracy is to survive the coming of the machine-age.

The questions, therefore, which must be answered are these two: (1) does the American college to-day provide its students with a basic fund of facts, of principles, and of knowledge in the various fields of contemporary life within which the major problems of our complex modern life are to be found, or which are able to enrich his own private life from a cultural, intellectual, or artistic standpoint? and (2) does the contemporary American college awaken a vital interest in the average student for these very things? Upon our answer to these two questions, based upon facts, the truth or falsity of the initial assertion of this essay will depend.

For any one who, like the writer of this essay, has been connected with American colleges and universities either as student or as instructor for the last seventeen years, with a mere intermission of less than four years, it is difficult to ask these questions in a serious vein, much less to be in doubt about the possible answer to them. For to such a one the failure of our colleges, especially in the matter of arousing the intellectual, artistic, and cultural interest on the part of any except the very exceptional student, is so patently obvious and so notoriously known and commonly admitted that it seems rather absurd seriously to raise the question at all.

Nevertheless, the American public is probably entitled to something more by way of proving the original contention of this essay than the mere dogmatic assertion of its author that the fact is widely known and commonly admitted. I shall, therefore, point to some very definite concrete facts and widely prevalent situations in order, if possible, to avoid this charge of dogmatic prejudice.

If we look for illustrations in answer to the first of our two questions, we find ourselves at once confronted with a development in contemporary American higher education which, since its inception, adoption, and propagation by President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard fame, has swept over the whole continent like wild-fire, and has made all of America's typical colleges — with the only exception of fairly recent experiments — slaves to itself. I refer, of course, to the so-called "elective system," which allows every college undergraduate a fairly large freedom of choice of subjects within the offered curriculum of the respective college. Under the operation of this system it has become possible for the college man to go through four years of almost any college of liberal arts in the United States without being obliged to familiarize himself with the basic foundations and principles in *all* of the fields and subjects in which the major problems of modern life are to be found. Of these, he should have at least the beginning of an understanding if he is to become an intelligent citizen in the world of to-day, as well as of those things which would contribute vitally to the enrichment of his own personality in terms of art and culture. But, under the operation of this system, it has become positively *impossible* even for the exceptional student to meet the basic requirement of our first question simply because he cannot within the span of eight semesters (or twelve quarters, as the case may be) get in all of the foundation courses in all of these fields in addition to the requirements in his chosen major subject and the general and group requirements of the particular college in which he is a student. In other words, the "elective system" with its usual requirement of an "undergraduate major subject" [4] prohibits a broad basic intellectual and cultural foundation from being given by our colleges to our contemporary college students. The nearest most of our average colleges come to laying such a foundation is in the so-called "orientation courses," usually given in the freshman (or sometimes in the freshman and sophomore) years. But these courses are of only recent origin and are, moreover, in the very nature of the case, because of time limitation and competition with other courses at the same time, incapable of meeting the real need for a thorough foundation in all of the various fields and subjects. But they do, as a matter of fact, prove the contention of this essay in that they show that college leaders from coast to coast have finally themselves realized the danger of our present system in not giving the student a thorough and broad intellectual, artistic, and cultural foundation. The "orientation courses" are an inadequate sop thrown to the student in the attempt to cover up our dreadful failure at this point and to try in some wholly insufficient way to make up for the general neglect. The simple fact of the case is that the broadening and liberalizing influence of our colleges of liberal arts is rapidly vanishing, if indeed there is any such influence left in them. As the Secretary of the Interior, Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, who is also president of Stanford University, has recently [5] stated it, the American college of liberal arts is slowly being ground out of existence between the lower millstone of the growing junior college idea (which is hardly much more than a glorified high school) and the upper millstone of the graduate and professional schools. The system of undergraduate "major subjects" is, in fact, nothing more or less than starting professional school work in undergraduate years. And how far this has reached down into and has come to dominate the whole college course of study may be seen by the fact that most American colleges now require that the "major subject" be chosen by the beginning of the sophomore (second) year in college. No wonder that our college graduates, except in so far as they happen to

---

[4] By an "undergraduate major subject" is meant at present the generally followed college-rule that every student, before he can be allowed to gradu-

---

ate, shall have taken a minimum number of courses, usually amounting to about one fourth of the number of unit-credits required for graduation, within one specific department (the department to be chosen by the student), thus giving him a fair proficiency in this one subject.

[5] At a general meeting of educators in Chicago in March, 1930.

have majored in the same subjects or prepared for identical professions or occupations, have so little in common to talk about, unless it be the weather, prohibition, or sex. Even the political party, which a generation ago, was the main subject of conversation in the then still masculine barber-shops, is no longer a live issue for conversation.[6] Not having developed a common fund of basic knowledge and understanding of the facts and principles underlying the various fields and avenues of human interest and endeavor, they obviously have no common things about which they might intelligently and profitably converse. Certainly an educational system which so totally misses its task of truly liberating the growing minds of our would-be educated citizens cannot even by excuse honestly be called "liberal."

Just let me add one or two more brief but graphic illustrations of the appalling ignorance of contemporary American collegians in realms of common and wide interest as soon as one gets the least bit outside of the individual student's respective "major subject." I have actual and personal knowledge of college students (and they were not freshmen) who thought that William James was the notorious Jesse James and who said that John Dewey was the admiral who won the Battle of Manila. In fact, last fall the writer heard of and personally met the editor of a college weekly paper (himself a junior in a college recognized by the American Association of Universities) who, when told about the approaching seventieth birthday of John Dewey and the preparations of international character which were being laid for the celebration of the event, replied by asking: "And who is John Dewey?" And a senior student, when asked by the writer if he knew who Irving Babbitt is, replied: "Of course, I've read that book," while ten out of a class of eleven upper division students admitted never having heard of Albert A. Michelson, A. Lawrence Lowell, Alexander Meiklejohn, or William McDougall. Experiments made with these same students in the realms of contemporary literature, graphic arts, and music revealed no better situation except in the case of students whose major subject was in one of these fields. Such names as Paul Elmer More, Lorado Taft, and Edward MacDowell seem to mean nothing to the average American collegian. Is it necessary to add further proofs to establish my contention that the American college of to-day does *not* provide its students with a fund of basic facts and principles which would help them to live intelligently, understandingly, and appreciatively in our modern world?

---

[6] I should add, of course, that I do not consider this to be so much the fault either of women's bobbed hair or of the college-student and his interests, as of the two major parties themselves. In other words, as between these there really is nothing to talk about.

Again, when it comes to the matter of citing concrete facts to prove my contention that the contemporary American college of liberal arts does not, on the whole, awaken the average student's *interest* in intellectual, artistic, and cultural subjects and pursuits, it is all too easy to do so. Is there any one familiar with our present-day college population who would deny that for every contemporary collegian who is really vitally and personally interested in the various and numerous subjects of his (so-called) liberal arts studies there are fifty college students who instead show an exuberance of interest in intercollegiate athletics either as participants on the field or from the sidelines? Or would any one seriously claim that the average American college student is one-fourth as much interested in the vast majority of his academic subjects as he is interested in his social fraternity? Or does any one honestly believe that the average modern collegian has become so interested in any number of, say, social sciences that he burns the midnight oil as readily and as regularly poring over his serious social studies as he does in giving himself to his social engagements, such as dances, card parties, petting parties, and the like? Merely to have asked these questions is to have answered them. And when it comes to the general reading of the non-required material which to-day's average collegian engages in it becomes more than ever apparent how intellectually, artistically, and culturally low and uncouth are his interests and tastes. Let me, at this point, give a few very telling figures as partial results of a survey made during the first semester of the college year 1929-1930 by a senior class in College Problems among the students of the College of the Pacific in Stockton, California.

Two hundred and eighty-four undergraduate students, or almost one-half of the enrollment in the College of Liberal Arts of this institution, replied to the questionnaire in the matter of indicating their favorite periodicals. Here are some of the most important results to this question: The magazine polling the largest number of votes was *The American Magazine*, with 104 voting it one of their favorite periodicals. A close second was *The Saturday Evening Post* with a total number of 90 votes. Other favorites were *The Cosmopolitan Magazine* with 39, *Collier's* with 35, and *Good Housekeeping* with 35 votes. As over against that such leading American journals as the following received the respective number of votes (as indicated after each title in parenthesis): *The Forum* (13), *The Outlook* (7), *Scribner's* (6), *Current History* (6), *The Century Magazine* (5), *World's Work* (3), *The Review of Reviews* (3), *The Nation* (2), *The New Republic* (2), *The Saturday Review of Literature* (2), *The Bookman* (1), and *The North American Review* (1). Such magazines as *Science*, *The Yale Review*, *The Scientific Monthly*, or *Survey* did not even appear on the list with a single vote. It is true, of course, that this survey tells the story of only one particular college and by no means even the whole story of that, since over fifty per cent of the liberal arts student-body did not vote at all. But having personally been connected with collegiate and university institutions from coast to coast, and from Columbia University in the East to the University of California and Stanford University in the West, the present writer will not admit that the situation indicated by these partial returns from the student-body of the College of the Pacific is at all unusual or fundamentally different from what would very probably be found in almost any other contemporary American higher institution of learning. Does one need to draw any deductions on the matter of college students' major interests from facts and figures which speak as loudly as do these returns on the collegians' favorite magazines?

Or, let a famous football coach come to the college and address the students. They will flock to the hall in an attempt to hear him. Then compare this with the usual corporal's guard which turns out to listen to the lecture of a great visiting professor or thinker from our own country or from abroad. Or take the crowds which usually shine by their absence at music-recitals, concerts, and art-exhibits. It is the attendance at such occasions, especially as compared with the mob usually flocking to listen to inanities or to see non-entities, which proves, it seems to me, beyond the shadow of a doubt the real interests and lack of interests of our contemporary collegians. And the places they frequent, the occasions they attend, the persons they go to hear, the things they go to see *after* graduation from college and *after* they have gotten out into the work of the world tell the selfsame story. A friend of mine recently organized a University Club in a neighboring community, intending to bring before its membership some outstanding lecturer at least once each month. He told me that in approaching many eligible men, university graduates, in his community about joining the Club he was by more than fifty per cent of them rebuffed with the reply: "Ah, I don't want to belong to any such 'high-brow' organization." And this from graduates of colleges and universities of recognized standing.

The simple fact is, the average American college of to-day so far misses its major opportunity of providing its graduates with the wherewithal of making worthy and intelligent use of their leisure time by arousing their interest, while in college, in things intellectual, artistic, and cultural, that, in the opinion of the present writer, at least, it often does much more harm than good. Too often it confirms and strengthens the undergraduates' belief in the *status quo* in almost every field of human life and endeavor, because it is afraid to march too far ahead of its time or to arouse the criticism of its donors or of the public. Thus instead of bringing about much needed changes in many directions it too often helps to perpetuate existing conditions and evils. A really thorough background in these fields together with the vital interest which comes with an intelligent understanding of them could never let these students go out into life as mere rubber-stamps of existing conditions.

From the standpoint of the individual student and of his future career, however, there is a still worse aspect of contemporary college life and its customary tendencies. That is the fact that by far the largest majority of these students spend their four years in college doing as little aside from loafing and having a good time as they find they can "get by" with. And it is a commonly known fact that, in general, almost any one who can bluff can manage to "get by" with astonishingly little real hard work or serious independent thinking. So that by far the most of our present-day college students are primarily training themselves to be loafers and experts in deceit. If the reader will remember that, in addition to these four years of college loafing, the majority of these students have already four years of high school loafing behind them — especially in states such as the State of California, where by state law the entire population up to the age of sixteen is in school full time, which, in general, means high school, of course — he may (or again he may not quite) be able to make a mental picture for himself of what these modern college graduates are going to be like. He may, indeed, consider what they are likely to achieve out in the world where practically each man has to make his own mark by what he is able to achieve by the power and strength of his own personality and by the results of his training and education. I confess very frankly that the prospects do not appear very promising to at least *one* who has not been able to close his eyes entirely to what he has seen going on around him in the so-called college halls of learning.

I shall, of course, be told that college graduates comparatively speaking make better records by far in life than do others. I am not at all unfamiliar with this claim. But, in the light of my own experience of watching, more or less closely, fifteen classes of college graduates go out into finding their places in the everyday affairs of life, and, in addition to this, having been thrown with college graduates of all kinds of years and institutions, I am forced to the assertion that the vast majority of them hardly ever fail to give unmistakable evidence of their narrowness of outlook, lack of mental vigor, and total absence of artistic appreciation or cultural tastes. What the claimed "success" of these college graduates, then, might consist of is perhaps best left to the fertile imagination of more optimistic viewers of the situation. It is probably "success" in the accepted *American* sense of the word: in the amassing of material wealth. The very fact that the achievements of men and women, supposedly familiar with and trained in the appreciation of riches of a totally different nature, is ever estimated in terms of the relative sizes of their respective bank accounts is mute evidence of the low level to which the estimate of the college graduate's success has sunk.

If, finally, it be asked: "What is the cause of this colossal failure of the American college?" I must admit that a thorough answer to this question involves very much more than I shall be able to say here in a few words. Nevertheless I shall take the hazard of briefly pointing to a few elements in the present college situation which, if not solely or completely responsible for the present failure of these institutions at the point of most importance, are yet among the major reasons for existing conditions.

In the first place, I do not see how the high school and the preparatory school in general can be absolved from having to shoulder a major portion of the blame. Under present conditions in our high schools one has to confess that the student who manages to go through those four years and still has any mental curiosity left is indeed next to a miracle. For the high school student who really has exceptional brain-power and also the desire to do honest and hard work usually finds out very early in his freshman year that he not only can "get by" on almost no serious mental effort, but that he can, in fact, still top the list of his class by doing not much more than play around. A little careful attention in class and a few extra moments of looking at one book or another at home usually will prove sufficient to keep the brilliant student at the head of his class. Why, then, should he exert himself? And there begin four years of high school laziness and loafing and wasting time, soon to be followed by four years more of the same thing in college.

Of course, the faculty of the average American college of to-day also will have to accept a large portion of responsibility. For there is no denying the fact that a stone might just as well be able to arouse the interest or awaken the enthusiasm or inspire creative and independent thinking on the part of a college student as many of these dull and uninspiring creatures who go under the name of "college professors." The few men among them who are real fountains of inspiration show only the more glaringly the general and widespread dearth of such truly great men.[7]

It must, however, not be forgotten that at least a fair proportion of blame for many college instructors' failure must be laid at the door of college policies rather than at that of the professor himself. How, for example, can a man be inspiring to his classes when — as happens quite regularly in the average American college — he has to teach five or even six different courses (even though they happen to be in the same department) within any one semester? Such a teaching load, running up to fifteen and sixteen hours per week, it may be possible to carry, but it is not possible to do justice to it or to the students who are being made to suffer under such conditions as much as the instructor suffers himself. No man can keep up-to-date and fresh and inspired in that many courses all at the same time; it is simply a physical and mental impossibility. How, then, can he be a continuous inspiration to his students? Nor is it possible to overlook the further fact that faculty salaries are still altogether inadequate in the average American college. That this also has a very vital and direct effect upon teaching cannot be denied. In the first place, it keeps many of the best minds out of the profession entirely. And many of those who are engaged in it are many times far below par simply because the financial shoe pinches and they have to figure out ways and means of making ends meet when they should be able to put this time, energy, and worry on their academic pursuits. Here are two factors, then, which cannot but have a tremendous bearing on some of the failures of our higher educational system, for no professor who has to spread himself over too large an area of subject-matter and who in addition to this finds himself financially cramped and therefore worried, can possibly be at his best as an inspirer of youth.

But beyond all of these factors and probably more responsible than any of them for the tendency and direction of present-day American college education is the whole system of education which has been evolved for these higher institutions of learning under the "elective and major-subject program." I think it is useless longer to question the fact that, if the major contention of this essay is correct at all — namely, that a liberal arts education in a democratically-minded nation finding itself in the machine-age must primarily be education for the wise and worthy use of leisure time — this whole system of education must be pronounced to be fundamentally and radically wrong. This fact is borne out not merely by many of the chapters of this symposium, but, even more definitely and concretely so, by the actual new educational projects and experiments mentioned and described in many of these chapters and, in most cases, inaugurated and developed by the respective authors of these very essays.

---

[7] I have discussed this problem of the college professor in a separate article in *School and Society*, Vol. XXVI, No. 671 (November 5, 1927), pp. 577-581, under the title "Is the Professor Blameless?"

And finally, it will have to be said that the whole spirit of contemporary America is partly responsible for the present plight of our colleges. For the America of to-day is not only immersed in the machine-age but in the materialism which is its inevitable by-product. The whole spirit of our age, therefore, tends away from intellectual, artistic, and cultural interests toward an ever increasing worship of things and comforts and luxuries, all of a concrete and material character. So that it is hardly fair to try to blame our contemporary college population in any one-sided or exclusive fashion for existing conditions within college walls.

And yet, it is just as against this indefensible, yes, dangerous because calamity-preparing, spirit of the age that the college after all has a very distinct and unequivocal duty. I do not mean that the college should educate its students so far beyond existing conditions and ideas that the graduates could never again feel at home in the actual world in which they must live. So far from implying any such thing I feel, in fact, that in the machine-age it is precisely the college's task to fit the student to *understand* the machine and its tremendous effects upon human conditions of living, so that he will be able to take his place in the real world of facts intelligently and with a clear comprehension of the situation. It would be idle folly to rave against the machine. The machine is here to stay and one of the greatest educational tasks of our generation is to teach men to understand not merely the running of a machine but the government and behavior of a society which *nolens volens* has to develop in a machine-civilization. To learn to use the machine for *human* advancement and progress is one of the *sine qua nons* of our age and generation. For either man will finally learn to use and control the machine as a tool in his hands and for his advantage, or else the machine — even though invented and created by man himself — will finally spell the doom of everything humanly most worth while.

Here we have already touched the further problem. To learn to master the machine is not enough. Or rather, mastery of the machine is not likely to be achieved unless it is preceded by mastery of the self. Education can never, when true to itself, remain satisfied with merely fitting a man into the economic and industrial structure of society or even with making him feel at home in the sort of factual world of affairs which he is going to find after graduation. Higher education, especially, is commissioned to make a student see beyond the limited and narrow horizon of his own age and generation. It must give him historical perspective as well as a perspective of comparative values which will make it possible for him to see his age and generation, if not actually *sub specie æternitatis*, then at least with the intelligent understanding which comes only from a long range view and from an appreciation of the truly *human* (i.e., reflectively rational, morally choosing, and spiritually self-transcending) values. How totally oblivious the average American college student and college graduate is to even the realization of the *existence* and much more so to a true understanding of these fundamentally *human* values, is a fact of too common and widespread experience to need specific and concrete proof at this point. Moreover, some of that proof has already been given in the previous argument of this essay, especially in the discussion of the college student's laziness and deceitfulness. He is, manifestly, cheating no one so much as himself, but seems to have so little capacity for the comprehension of this fact that it never occurs to him. His moral sense seems, in fact, so dulled by lack of training and experience that, even when his attention is called to his absurd self-deception, he cannot seem to comprehend it. Usually he goes on in the same old way.

If other ages, nations and races could not survive the breakdown of morality and of moral distinctions and considerations, a civilization dominated by the machine can much less hope to survive such a moral decline. If our colleges of liberal arts, therefore, fail here as they seem to fail in the matter of education for the wise and worthy use of leisure time, they are merely failing at one more of the critical points of our contemporary life. Or is all of this perhaps a part of the selfsame situation and problem? Very likely. For a worthy use of leisure time implies an understanding and appreciation of relative values as well as the self-mastery needed in order to be able not merely to *choose* the higher human values but also to *act* on these higher and nobler choices.[8]

Unquestionably I shall be told: "Physician, heal thyself." It will be pointed out to me that any one can criticize and pick faults, but that it takes a truly constructive mind to suggest and give us something better.

To which critics I should like to reply that it is also comparatively easy to make very definite and concrete suggestions for changes and improvements from behind the relative safety of a teacher's desk, where one does not seriously run the chance of having one's pet theories proved a still greater failure than the situation which one has set out to remedy. I therefore prefer to leave the matter of definite suggestions for concrete and detailed changes of program and of method to the men (administrators and professional "educators") who are out in the field and whose real practical task consists of these very things.

---

[8] Some of my readers may think it strange that in this essay on "The Most Critical Failure of the American College" I should so totally have forgotten the matter of scholarship as not even once to have mentioned the word. I am woefully aware of the fact that the average American college, so far from producing real scholars, is so organized and directed as almost to put a premium on the lack of true scholarship. If, nevertheless, I have not addressed myself to this situation this is due to the fact that, if the major contention of this essay is valid, the task of the college of liberal arts cannot be that of the production of scholars. The matter of scholarship, in other words, I consider to be primarily a problem of the graduate schools, although the *taste* for scholarship should *naturally* be developed during one's undergraduate years if it is ever to amount to much later on.

Whatever the suggested concrete changes or improvements might be, however, I am very certain that they must be made on the basis of two *prior* factors: they must be preceded first by an understanding of the major failures of our present system and methods; and they must rest upon an at least attempted understanding of the total present situation, that is to say, upon a true realization of what it really is that we want done and what needs to be done by higher education, and also of the principles underlying all true and worthy education, basic among which must always be that of the student's own interest. Without such a fundamental understanding of our age and of the situation of our country as it actually is at the present time it will, manifestly, be impossible to find or suggest any worthy remedies. And, after all, these two were precisely the considerations to which I have addressed myself in this discussion, because I feel that a clear understanding of them must precede any and all concrete changes and improvements of our higher educational systems. Before we can safely *do* anything about our colleges, we must *know* (1) where we are, and (2) where we want to go. It is only *after* these discoveries that we can attempt to find out *how* to get there.

In the meantime, the American college, like Bertrand Russell's universe, will probably "go on its relentless way."

II

William McDougall

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE ENDOWED UNIVERSITIES OF AMERICA

II

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE ENDOWED UNIVERSITIES OF AMERICA

William McDougall

PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY, DUKE UNIVERSITY
[FORMERLY FELLOW IN OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITIES,
AND PROFESSOR IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY]

AMERICA is magnificently furnished with institutions of higher education. Profound belief in and enthusiasm for education were expressed in the early years of colonization by the founding of such colleges as Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary. This belief and enthusiasm have never waned, but rather have grown and have become solidly embedded in the traditions of the national life; and now, it would seem, the time is at hand when college education will be regarded as the natural right of every American boy and girl. Already the establishment for higher education seems to be more than ten times as large as that of Great Britain; and this in spite of the rapid increase of British universities in the last fifty years. Of this immense development Americans may well be proud and hopeful. It is matter only for congratulation. Education, and especially higher education, is one of those good things of which no nation can have too much. The proposition, though it might be doubted if applied to a people destined to live indefinitely under some form of autocratic government, seems beyond question for a people wholeheartedly committed to democracy. The services to the American nation rendered by the universities and colleges have been and are of incalculable value. If one tries to imagine America wholly deprived of them, the imagination balks at the contemplation of so desolate a scene. I can imagine the British, the French, and even the Germans continuing to thrive in some degree and even to preserve something of culture and of intellectual activity without their universities. But, without hers, America would indeed be a howling wilderness, would sink rapidly into chaos and decay. Yet, though the universities are rendering to the nation indispensable services of the first importance, there are many signs of discontent, many voices crying that all is not well with them, that great changes are needed. And this in spite of the fact of very considerable variety of type and constitution and wide ranging experiment among them in curricula and methods of instruction. This volume is an organized expression of this discontent, and a deliberate effort to overhaul the system and to suggest improvements.

It is no slight honor that I, a foreigner, should be invited to take part in this effort. I respond by frankly bringing to bear the experience gained by many years of work in several British universities. If I seem to the reader to hold up the older universities of England as models, I would assure him that I am not unaware of their defects and that, in suggesting certain features of them for imitation in America, I am trying to imagine a type of university which, by combining the best features of the best universities of the two countries, shall approach perfection. It is mainly by such selective adoption of the best features of allied types that our social institutions are improved.

The university system in America possesses a unique feature that greatly facilitates such selective experimentation, namely, the existence side by side of the universities supported by public funds and those which rely upon endowments received in the past and the current contributions of private benefactors. The institutions of the latter type are in the main of older date than the others. They were founded in the same spirit and with the same purpose as the old English universities; namely, in order to secure to the community a succession of men of literary and scientific education who should keep alive culture and learning and should serve it as guides and teachers, more especially in the sphere of religion. The accepted English ideal of the State-Church was to insure the presence in each local community of at least one cultured Christian gentleman; and a prime function of the universities was to educate the men who were to serve Church and State and community in that capacity. Although the early colonists had rejected some of the features of the English social system and though their communities were not of so uniform a pattern as those of the mother country, they seem to have reproduced very effectively this special feature. Their ministry, educated in the colleges for this special function, seem to have exerted as leaders and guides an even greater influence than the English clergy, with all the support of their Church by the State, were able to maintain in the same period.

The well-recognized function of the colleges was to educate a select few, destined to become members of a true aristocracy, a few to whom a great privilege was granted and from whom correspondingly great services were expected.

With the rapid increase and diffusion of economic resources, this distinctive function, although never formally repudiated, has been lost to sight: for it was not in harmony with the American tendency to regard all men as of equal natural capacity and as having equal claims to every advantage and opportunity. The formula that all men are created equal has been interpreted literally by the popular mind, both in the sense that all men have equal claims to just and humane treatment (which is true) and that all men are equally well endowed by nature to profit by education and to perform any function (a dogma which, though still taught by a few misguided and belated scientists, is grossly untrue). A logical corollary of this naïve belief in the literal equality of natural endowment is the childish belief that it is possible to devise some educational process which shall develop all young persons subjected to it into intellects of the first water. And this belief, though few explicitly avow it, seems to underly implicitly much of the current discussion of educational methods. For educators cannot easily admit the very narrow limitations of achievement of the educational process in its application to individuals. The same men who never tire of pointing to the few (the Lincolns and Arkwrights, the Stephensons and Garfields) who rise from humblest stations to great achievements, as evidences of the high natural abilities of the common man, neglect to note that these men rose in spite of their lack of all scholastic advantages; and they make the utterly illogical deduction that formal education, if only it be applied in some ideal form yet to be devised, can raise all men to similar heights of capacity, if not of achievement.

This belief is so amiable and generous that to point to its fallacy seems churlish or snobbish; and it is so deeply rooted in the heart of the enthusiastic educator that it defies all evidence and all logic. Confronted with the fact that the vast apparatus of education has hitherto done nothing to justify the belief, the enthusiast brushes it aside with two answers: first, the educational process has been at fault; the children have had too much Latin or not enough Latin, or too much or not enough of arithmetic or geometry or natural science or manual work, etc.; secondly (and this has been the main resource), the process has not been applied early enough. Even Oxford University, whose principal studies have been logic and rhetoric, cannot avoid this fallacy in logic. It has met every proposal for change with the argument — Our educational process must be excellent; see what splendid men it turns out! To which, of course, the logical answer is — See what splendid youths you manage to attract!

Under the influence of this generous fallacy arose the demand that the privileges of higher education should not be restricted to a select few, but should be at the command of every young American. In response to this demand the State universities were founded, and many of them have grown to enormous proportions. And, since this demand seems likely to be imperiously maintained by the mass of the people, they are likely to grow and multiply indefinitely.

In face of this development the endowed colleges have taken one or other of two lines. Some, recognizing the many advantages of the college community limited in number to some few hundreds, have deliberately refused to expand, have set a strict limit to the number of their students, and have sought to retain something of their original functions and ideals. Others, stimulated by the spectacle of the rapidly expanding State universities, have made strenuous efforts to meet the unlimited and ever growing demand, and, at the cost of subservience to their alumni, the main source of new endowments, have accepted increasing numbers of students and have not yet prescribed any limits to their expansion.

The endowed colleges that have adopted the former policy, the policy of restriction of numbers, find themselves confronted with the fact that education in the experimental sciences requires a very expensive material equipment, and that to provide an adequate equipment for study in the principal and fundamental sciences for a small number of students involves a very extravagant and almost prohibitive expenditure. Those on the other hand that have followed the second policy and have expanded into large universities have lost the peculiar advantages of collegiate life and are constantly struggling with the problems of quantity-production, with all the influences so detrimental to the best university work which such production inevitably entails. The consequence of the course of development here hastily sketched is that America lacks universities which combine, as the older English universities so happily do, the advantages of collegiate life with highest university standards of instruction and research, unhampered by the necessity of dealing with an excessive number of students; universities which make it their prime business to secure to a limited number of highly selected students the fullest possible benefits. In spite of the vast expenditure America is not securing the richest possible returns. I suggest that the true and only remedy for this state of affairs is to be found in the clear differentiation of the functions of the endowed and of the State universities. While the latter must continue to meet as best they may the popular demand for higher education on a vast scale, it is for the endowed institutions to aim primarily and solely at quality, at securing a limited number of highly selected students and providing them, regardless of expense, with the conditions most conducive to those results which are of greatest value. Already some efforts in the directions to be indicated have been initiated. I propose to define what would seem to me the most essential of the steps to be taken in order to remedy the present state of affairs.

First, the frank adoption of the college system within the endowed universities. This does not mean the restriction of the total number of students within the university to a number that forbids development of much that is of the very essence of university life. About four hundred students is the largest number that can reside in one college without sacrificing some of the advantages of collegiate life. And this number is far too small to obtain, without gross extravagance, even moderately good provision of such equipment as libraries and laboratories. It means the creation of several residential groups of students and teachers within each university. Experience has shown that this system brings many great advantages, obtainable in no other way. Among these may be mentioned, first, the more intimate personal contacts, academic and social, among the members of the collegiate body. Secondly, the setting up of stimulating emulation between the several collegiate groups. The benefit of this factor is perhaps most obvious, though not most important, in relation to the athletic pursuits of the students. Where the American university has one football team of semi-professional gladiators, for whom victory in a few struggles against other universities becomes the supreme object, the score of colleges of the English university support as many football teams which *play* against one another in a friendly fashion about twice a week throughout the season. It may be roughly estimated that, among a given number of students, the English system secures about fifty times as much actual playing of the game as among the same number of American students; if indeed the terms "play" and "game" are at all applicable to the American procedures. And it reduces to a minimum the questionable exercise of looking on and uttering frantic yells at every slightest occasion in a condition of artificially stimulated mob-emotion. And a similar difference is found in each of the great fields of athletic effort.

In all academic pursuits similar benefits accrue from the emulation of a number of colleges closely associated within the one university. And, especially, the multiple college system promotes intimacy between faculty and students, an intimacy which renders possible stimulation, supervision and estimation of the students in an informal fashion, and which conduces to a minimum of formal regulation, compulsory attendance, quasi-mechanical grading and illicit practices for "gettin' by."

In the absence of the college system the American universities have developed three most unsatisfactory substitutes, namely, the class-system, the fraternities and the freshman dormitories. I will not dwell upon the drawbacks and inadequacies of the first and second; they are sufficiently obvious and well known. But a word on the third seems in place. Some kind of control and some degree of supervision of the freshman is desirable; but the freshman dormitory is a most undesirable method of securing these benefits. One of the principal advantages properly expected by the boy from his residence at the university is intimate contact with a variety of other minds and especially with older men. But the freshman dormitory system herds him with equally callow and inexperienced youths and largely denies him that initiation into the life of the university which should come from such contacts.

THE continuing prestige and great influence of the older English universities is not merely a matter of traditional sentiment and of beautiful surroundings invested with the charm of antiquity. These things play their part. Of much greater influence is the fact that these universities have been able, largely by means of the scholarships offered to their undergraduate members, to attract the ablest boys from every part of the British Empire. The endowed universities of America need to develop a similar system in an improved form which I have long advocated in England.

Each college should make an actuarial estimate of the *total* annual expenditure upon each of its undergraduate members; and it should require from each of these the payment of fees equal to this amount. This would be a very considerable sum, one far larger than is paid by any undergraduate at the present time. It should offer for open competition a number of scholarships; the emoluments of these scholarships should range from a sum equal to (or rather larger than) the fees charged to a sum equal to one-half of this amount. If the financial resources of the college will enable it to fill all of its limited number of annual vacancies with scholars thus selected, so much the better. If its funds are insufficient for this purpose, it should fill the remaining vacancies by competitive examination, qualified by personal estimate. This number would most naturally be chosen from among the unsuccessful candidates for scholarships. It should be a well-recognized principle and matter of personal honor that, if a scholarship were awarded to a youth of ample private means, or to one whose parents have such means, he should return to the college part, or the whole, of the emoluments of his scholarship. The definition of such means would be a problem of some delicacy; but one not incapable of solution.

In the successive years of their residence all the students would be in open competition for advancement in respect of the value of their scholarships or, in the case of those who entered without scholarships, for election to scholarships.

Under such a system all the ablest boys in the whole country would be enabled to enjoy higher education under the best possible conditions; and they would be concentrated in the endowed colleges, where they would be in constant contact and emulation with a group of equally able youths, or at least a group of youths showing a high average of ability and of interest in and application to the things of the mind. They would no longer need to creep apologetically about vast campuses dominated by the lords of the "Gold Coast," of the fraternities, of the football team and of the track.

The scholarships for undergraduates should be supplemented by a smaller number of fellowships, to which should be elected the most promising of those graduates who aspire to devote themselves to academic careers. A fellowship should mean emoluments sufficient to support a bachelor in modest comfort and security of tenure for at least three years, with good prospect of renewal for a further period, on condition only that the fellow give his time and energy to study and research. The various fellowships of the national foundations do not and cannot adequately meet this need. The college only has such intimate knowledge of its students as is requisite for the satisfactory control of such fellowships. To bring together in one place where the apparatus and atmosphere of learning exist a number of bright keen minds, or a group of students of whom a large proportion have such minds, is the primary function of a university. To this all else is secondary. Curricula, methods of instruction, organization, degrees — no juggling or experimentation with these and other subsidiary matters can produce the desired results. If the prime condition is not realized, if the naturally bright keen minds are but a few scattered through an inert mass of average minds, the atmosphere will remain commonplace, the standards will be low, and intellectual interests will continue to occupy a very minor place on the campus.

Beside this prime effect, the bringing together of a student body containing a large proportion of bright minds endowed with intellectual energy, the scholarship system would provide two other important advantages. First, it would provide the students with an additional and immediately urgent motive for strenuous application to their studies. University authorities constantly complain of the indifference of the students to their tasks; yet they persistently neglect to take the most obvious and effective measures to remedy that of which they complain. Instead, they countenance and even encourage such inane and harmful campus activities as the running of a daily paper by the students, a process in which the latter inevitably acquire the vices of journalism of the lower sort, hasty ill-considered comment expressed in slipshod fashion, and the habit of increasing preoccupation with trivialities; and they become slaves to that ogre of American life, "publicity." Secondly, an adequate scholarship system would abolish the practice of "working one's way through college." In many instances this practice implies and evokes such admirable qualities in the students concerned that it may seem churlish to denounce it; and, so far as I know, no American voice has ever been raised against it. Yet it is a pernicious system, for it gravely impairs the efficiency of the students. If students have been dispensing ice-cream-sodas till two o'clock in the morning or serving as hotel clerk or porter to the same hour, how shall they concentrate their minds on the substance of a morning lecture or do other than fall asleep on the benches? It is not merely that such outside work hampers the student in his specific tasks; but also it deprives him of the opportunities for leisure, for reading, for personal contacts and discussions, which are, or should be, among the most precious privileges of the student's life. It is a frequent complaint that the students do little or no independent reading, even if they faithfully perform their allotted tasks.

The earning of money is even more widely practiced and countenanced during the long vacation than during the college session. This is an equally great evil. It is true that it launches students out of college better prepared to enter into the economic scramble. But that is not a proper function of the college. The long vacation is the best and proper time for intensive independent study. Yet I venture the estimate that not two per cent of American college students seriously devote any considerable part of the long vacation to such study. Instead, if they have money, they fly restlessly about the world; and if they have not (and the sons of wealthy parents often follow the practice under the influence of public approval of it) they spend the summer in all sorts of menial and trivial but well paid occupations. Few American students come from homes where any studious occupation is easy or possible. It is the more necessary that the endowed college should encourage serious independent study in the long vacation, by throwing open, during a considerable part of the long vacation, its facilities, its dormitories, libraries, laboratories and playing fields, to those students who may wish to profit by such opportunities. A minimum of organization and supervision would be needed — merely a few persons in authority who would immediately dismiss any student who in any way abused this privilege. In my undergraduate days at Cambridge an informal long-vacation period of this sort, known as "The Long," was found by many students, of whom I was one, to be the most pleasant and profitable part of the college year.

The endowed university, in instituting such a long-vacation period for informal study, would render to the culture of her own students and of the country at large a much needed service, one of greater value than the provision of frantic summer sessions in which most of the undesirable features of the regular sessions are reproduced in aggravated form. These might safely be left to the State universities.

In this connection a word may be said for the time-honored English system of informal reading-parties during the long vacation. An instructor or advanced student gathers a little group of students of his own subject and carries them off, together with a small collection of well chosen books, to some quiet mountain or seashore retreat, where they may lead the simple life, combining outdoor recreation with a reasonable amount of study under his supervision. Surely an ideal plan for the sharpening of wits and the formation of lasting friendships.

It may be objected to the proposals of the foregoing paragraphs that, in spite of abundant scholarships, it might be impossible to obtain a sufficient number of students of high quality to form the main mass of the college population, that even many able youths would prefer the herd-life of the great campus with all its organized distractions and over-organized academic routine. It is true that the mass of men do not crave liberty and independence, but prefer rather to be told exactly what is expected of them. It is true that the average student on entering college appreciates the system of minute prescriptions which leave him no scope for choice and no responsibility other than to do as he is told; just as the average man on entering the army appreciates the relief from all responsibility other than obedience. But it is the function of the colleges to correct, at least to work against, this weakness of human nature, rather than to foster it by every means in their power, as they now do.

And it is for the endowed colleges to compete for the ablest students by offering them, not only the honors and the emoluments of adequate scholarships, but also the most favorable possible conditions of all kinds for study, culture and self-development. Among such conditions, the material ones are of no small importance.

In the colleges of the older English universities it was (until the poverty and crowding resulting from the World War introduced some modification) the rule for each student to have exclusive occupation of a set of rooms, consisting in almost all cases of a small bedroom and a living room of moderate dimensions. This is the minimum requirement for studious and healthful living; yet it is a requirement not supplied by the great majority of American colleges, even those largely populated by sons of the wealthy classes. It seems to be the rule to herd the students together, two, three, four or even more in one set of rooms, consisting often of a single room or sometimes of two rooms. Here he lives in utmost discomfort and disorder. It seems to be expected that these rooms shall serve only as sleeping quarters (the common appellation "dormitories" implies it). The students are to do all their reading in the common reading-room of the library (too often under the constant distraction of the near presence of attractive young women) and all their eating in public places. Thus the student has no place where he can sit down in comfort with a book and a pipe and possess his soul in quietude, no place where he can entertain his chosen friends, where in a score of ways he can express and develop his taste and personality, his individuality. If he should attempt to study, his roommates will probably pull his hard chair from under him, turn on a loud-speaker or a jazz gramophone, or at least talk loudly about girls or sport. I have heard more than one freshman complain that under such conditions it is absolutely impossible to do any serious work. The college authorities do not provide him with the elementary conditions of such work; yet constantly they reproach him with lack of industry and of serious interest in his studies.

It may seem a point of small importance if I insist that the student should have at least one room that he may call his own, and that he should as a rule take at least his breakfast in that room. The growing practice of taking all meals in public places is deplorable. A very simple equipment would enable each student to prepare his own breakfast and occasionally to entertain a friend or two at that meal. The tendency I deplore has gone so far that at Harvard the attempt to induce students to eat together in the fine dining-hall of the university has been abandoned in despair. The hall cannot compete with the attractions of the local cafeterias where the din is so deafening that conversation is impossible. To feed regularly under such conditions and to prefer them is a piece of barbarism which should not be countenanced. The prevalence of the practice breeds more barbarism and fosters the preference for herd-life, one of the most regrettable features of the present-day America. It would be easy to make attendance at dinner in the college hall five times a week a necessary part of the residence qualifying for a degree; and equally easy to supply and charge for "commons" (the materials of a simple breakfast) to all students in residence.

The American child, denied the privacy of the enclosed garden, finds his playground in the street; the decay of the family progressively denies him the advantages of privacy and of life in an intimate group. He grows up friendly with all (which is good) but intimate with none, not even with himself (which is very bad). College quarters of the kind indicated above would to some extent remedy the ill effects.

It will be replied that such housing of the students would be much more expensive than that at present commonly provided. To this the answer is that America, with her enormous wealth, can easily afford this simple and most desirable luxury for her selected youths. If poor England can afford it, why not America? In the rooms in which three or four students are herded together (shall we say stabled?) it is not uncommon to find an expensive installation of plumbing. If it is necessary to choose between plumbing and privacy, shall we not prefer privacy? A common wash-room with cold shower-bath can provide for the cleanliness of a large number of students at small expense; and a certain degree of Spartan simplicity in such matters is highly desirable. The American people is very luxurious. The college-student should be provided only with those higher luxuries that contribute to the development of personality, namely, privacy (the opportunity to be alone with his own thoughts, his books, his pen and paper, and at times his self-chosen friends), quiet and beautiful surroundings, far removed from the hellish noises of street-cars and jazz-bands, contacts with intellects richer and more disciplined than his own, characters more finely molded. He should learn to be independent of, if not to despise, the luxuries most sought after by the common herd — elaborate plumbing, iced drinks whether soft or hard, radios, automobiles, news, publicity, crowds organized and unorganized, and the sense of being just like everybody else in his crowd. It is absurd that the endowed universities (some of which annually announce the receipt of sums running near or above ten million dollars, in addition to their regular revenues) should deny to their students, on the ground of expense, the essential higher luxuries.

It may be objected that the average American student does not desire privacy, that he cannot endure to be alone, that he prefers to be constantly among companions, if not actually in a crowd. It is true that the gregariousness natural to man is excessively developed in the average American. But the answer is that we are here concerned not with averages, but rather with the exceptional few; and that it is very desirable that in these few the power to be alone and to stand alone should be fostered and developed, that they should be encouraged to find their companions largely among the great minds of all times and all places.

I HAVE no doubt that, as matters now stand, the introduction or development of the honors system in the endowed universities would be very advantageous. I mean the practice of awarding special distinctions for work of special excellence. The mere addition of such words as *cum laude* to the title of the degree awarded on graduation is not enough. In the English universities the student prepares himself for an honors or pass degree, and commonly makes his choice at or soon after entering college. The candidate for honors pursues a more advanced and more specialized course of study than the pass-man's. Some courses of instruction are taken by both classes of students; but many special courses are designed for honors-men only. And the honors-man graduates by taking a final examination very much more severe than that taken by the pass-man. It is a feature of the system that the honors-man, until he presents himself for his final or graduating examination, is troubled with very little in the way of tests and examinations. There can, I think, be no doubt that this is an excellent system for the honors-man. It throws upon him full responsibility for preparing himself for the final test. And, when that test comes, success depends upon his having acquired a well organized mass of knowledge in his chosen field or fields. To pass such an examination with credit, applying knowledge acquired and organized through several years of study, implies a higher form of study than does the mere securing of credit for a number of short courses of study ranging over a variety of subjects, which perhaps are but little related to one another. The American system seems designed to force the student to acquire a certain amount of general culture. The English honors-system recognizes that a good education requires the student to study some one branch of knowledge pretty thoroughly, to the point where he can exercise some independent critical judgment; and it throws on the student the responsibility of acquiring by his own independent reading and observation the necessary background of general culture. The American student is encouraged to put himself utterly in the hands of the university, which, on condition that he will do as he is told, undertakes to turn him out with a degree and a certain amount of diffused information. The English honors-student is told —"Here are opportunities to study intensively, to acquire mastery of some field of knowledge; go to it; do your best; show what you can do. If you succeed we shall give you a degree that will be a hall-mark, that will confer prestige and enable you to enter with the best advantages upon any vocation you may choose." The prestige attaching to a first-class honors-degree from Oxford or Cambridge is perhaps too great. But the endowed universities of America would do well if they could in some measure attach a similar prestige to their degrees.

In addition to inducing a thorough study of some field of knowledge and throwing full responsibility on the student for independent effort, the English system has the advantage of providing a very powerful stimulus. It is sometimes deprecated on the ground that the element of competition is overstressed. Yet human nature, if it is to bring its powers to fullest exercise and development, needs the stimulus of rivalry, emulation, and public recognition of success. No doubt, the ideal student works from sheer intellectual curiosity. But very few are of that type. It is the business of the university to stimulate the student to intense and sustained effort; and it must appeal to all honorable motives, and not least to the ambition proper to a young man.

If a university could secure a body of students all of whom were of high ability, it is probable that no differentiation between honors-men and honors-courses would be needed. But, since that condition is not likely to be satisfied, the development of the honors-system along the English lines would seem to be highly desirable, at least as a measure of transition to the ideal state of affairs under which all students would be honors-students.

In addition to the college system, the scholarships and fellowships, and the better rooming conditions (together with, of course, the usual equipment of library and laboratories), what the endowed university must have at all costs, if it is to secure its select body of able and keen students and to perform its function of educating a true aristocracy of leadership, is a distinguished and able faculty. For insuring the possession of such a faculty two methods must be used without stint. The endowed university, instead of spending the chief part of its resources on buildings (say five millions on buildings for a business-school) must frankly go into the market and buy the best talent to be had, in competition with the State universities, with the growing research institutions of industry, and with big business itself. It is perfectly inane to keep repeating that the true scholar cares nothing for money. The true scholar is or should be also a man; and he should desire to live a normal life and to be able to afford to bring up a family of more than one or two children, and to be able to do this without reducing his wife to drudgery. The full professor should receive a stipend that will enable him to bring up a family of moderate size without pinching; and a modest pension should be secured to him. The endowed universities would benefit themselves and render a great service to the commonwealth, if, in the remuneration of their faculties, they would introduce the system of family allowances, a system which I proposed in England thirty years ago and which is now finding much favor there and in several European countries. Secondly, the conditions of tenure must be made as attractive as possible to men devoted to things of the mind. Routine duties must be kept at a low figure, especially such duties as quizzing and examining. At present the regular courses of instruction are continued almost without a break from September to June. The strain of so long a period is too great. No work is so exhausting as the higher forms of teaching, study and research. The proportion of nervous breakdowns and premature deaths among the faculties of the greater institutions of learning in America is too large. The present system of unbroken routine teaching from September to June is maintained, I believe, because the students cannot be trusted to do independent work or employ their time in any profitable manner, if the routine should be intermitted for several weeks at Christmas and Easter, as in the English universities. Three periods, each of not more than nine weeks, is probably the best distribution of full routine instruction. The teachers as well as the students should regard the vacation period not merely as a time for idling or for running about Europe, but as opportunity for serious private work.

A good faculty-club and some provision for physical exercise by the faculty, such as reasonably pleasant and secluded outdoor tennis courts, are minor contributions to faculty efficiency that should not be neglected, as they are in some of the leading universities. And in every instance the university should take measures to ensure that its faculty can secure decent housing at reasonable rates within easy reach of the campus — a crying need in at least one great institution.

In short, the endowed university should do all in its power to make the life of the professor healthy, comfortable, secure, influential, dignified and honored of all men.

This leads to my last topic. Here I need to summon all my courage; for I am about to attack the dominant figure in the American scene, namely, the successful business-man.

The university professor, so long as he is merely the hired man of a corporation over which he has no control, will never enjoy the status of prestige and dignity which should be his. The business-men have mismanaged the endowed universities too long. The only well-founded claim of their management to success and continuance of their power is the fact that under such management several of these universities have become very wealthy. Perhaps this is evidence of good financial management. I do not question the honesty and efficiency of such management. But financial success is not enough. And the endowments of many institutions are now so large that there is no further need, at least no urgent need, for greater accumulations. The time has come when the faculty should take a firm line with the business autocrats under whose sway they live, should insist that the faculty shall have a predominant voice in the ultimate control of all university affairs, not only of instruction and academic standards, but also of finance and general policy and organization. It may be necessary to retain the services of one or more financial experts; though that is doubtful. The common assumption, that the making of money is proof of high intelligence and character and of wisdom for the conserving and spending of it, is not well founded.

I say the business-men who in the main have controlled the endowed colleges and universities have mismanaged them. They have neglected to introduce the features here insisted upon as primary desiderata. But my contention must be enforced and illustrated by citation of specific instances of neglect to do that which ought to have been done, to display that farsighted wisdom which may justly be expected to control great institutions that claim to be of national scope, leaders of the national culture.

It is true that at the present moment there are movements on foot in the direction of remedying some of these defects. But these belated movements are themselves the best evidence of the truth of the indictment.

The corporation of Harvard has erected in the college yard a series of very ugly buildings and has grossly neglected the esthetic aspects and various conveniences and amenities which they might and should have secured to the great institution committed to their hands. They have allowed it to become inextricably embedded in what can fairly be described as a very noisy and ugly business quarter. Farsighted wisdom would long ago have bought all the land lying between the college yard and the River Charles and have treated it as part of the college domain. Or, if difficulties created by a hostile Irish city-administration had rendered impossible the realization of that plan, it would have removed the whole institution to some spot at least ten miles further from the center of Boston. I suggest that the latter step might have been taken with great advantage to the university at any date before the building of the Widener library. The few buildings of historic and esthetic value might have been reconstructed on the new site.

I am less familiar with conditions at Yale, but I venture to remark that noisy street-car lines seem to traverse the very heart of the campus. And I suggest that even at Princeton the many pleasing buildings display a lack of harmony and arrangement that detracts greatly from their total effect.

Let the faculty insist on dominant representation on the governing body. And in all large matters of policy let there be initiative and ultimate decision vested in some body in which all faculty members shall have the right to speak and vote. Why this distrust of the democratic principle in the one sphere where it is possible to entrust power to an educated and intelligent democracy? Why this adhesion to a form of government which is a mixture of autocracy and plutocracy? Is it not a fair assumption that a governing body in which the faculty would predominate would display at least as much wisdom and large foresight as one consisting of men whose lives have been mainly devoted to the pursuit of financial profit?

12

Charles Abram Ellwood

SOCIAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

12

SOCIAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Charles Abram Ellwood

PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
[FROM SEPTEMBER 1930 TO BE AT DUKE UNIVERSITY]

THE condition of education in practically every civilized country remains unsatisfactory, and in no respect more unsatisfactory than in the field which is vaguely called "social education." Democratic countries, like the United States, in which government is supposed to be the rule of public opinion, might be expected to show a special interest in the social and political education of their citizens, since in those countries the mass of citizens are expected to participate to some extent in finding solutions for social and political problems. Yet no country has been more backward in organizing an effective scheme of social and political education than the United States.

It is very difficult for the intelligent student of educational systems to understand this. One would suppose that such an experiment in self-government would have sought from the very beginning for success through the political education of all the citizens admitted to the franchise. It is notorious, however, that most of the states of the American Union during the first half of the nineteenth century paid no attention to the political education of the mass of their citizens, despite the warnings of Washington and Jefferson. These states professed democracy in theory, but in practice they left the government to a handful of leading families, who were counted upon to manipulate the mass of voters, which, indeed, they usually did successfully. The historical cynic might, therefore, well doubt whether American democracy was founded upon the presupposition of political intelligence in the people.

A century and a half of experience in the art of self-government has of course brought some changes for the better. Yet if we compare these changes with the increase in numbers and complexity of our population, they have been slight. A German professor, a Ph.D of the University of Göttingen, who came to reside in the United States in the early seventies, told me in 1912 that he found the citizens in the seventies more politically intelligent than in 1912. In a relative sense this judgment was probably correct, because the people of the seventies were still living a relatively simple rural life and had not given up the old custom of holding town meetings. They were not called upon, moreover, to form judgments upon questions of international importance. The newspapers, too, of that day had more respect for truth and made less effort at mere sensationalism. In a relative sense it is possible that the citizens of the United States in 1870 were more politically intelligent than those just before the Great War. It would not do to suppose, however, that the town meeting (or open forum) and serious-minded newspapers could accomplish any such results at the present time. The world has become so much more complex and interdependent than it was two generations ago that these relatively informal methods of social and political education are no longer adequate.

American educators have found little encouragement to go ahead with social and political education from the examples set by the nations of Europe. Almost invariably in those nations such education has been subservient to the government, and such political education as has been given has been used by the rulers to bolster up their rule. Europe, moreover, does not seem to have changed for the better in this regard. In Soviet Russia we find that education has degenerated into a monstrous scheme of propaganda for a dogmatic Marxism and the Soviet form of government. In Italy social and political education is merely propaganda for Fascism. Even in the new Republic of Germany we are told on good authority that the scheme of public education is closely geared with the form of government. It is notorious that conditions are no better or different in France. In Great Britain there is little or no formal social and political education in the schools. Only in little Denmark do we seem to find a system of social and political education which would even half-way meet the approval of critics.

Perhaps the United States deserves no severe censure for failing to develop an adequate system of social and political education which would aim at producing intelligent citizens. It is evident that any such system is open to grave dangers and abuses. It is this fact which is usually pointed to by educators when students of social conditions lament the lack of such education. Yet a self-governing people must in some way secure social and political intelligence if there is to be any chance of success in the development of their institutions. The failures of other nations and of other times do not excuse us from undertaking by systematic means to develop the social and political intelligence of the masses, unless, indeed, we believe with Mussolini that the masses never can be qualified for self-government and that democracy is a mere illusion or pretence.

The belief that democracy is a mere illusion or pretence is not a tradition of the American people. The mass of our people still believe in our democratic experiment and even that that experiment cannot succeed without the development of social and political intelligence in the people. It is all the more inconsistent in us as a people, therefore, that we have failed to set ourselves to the task of developing social and political education in our schools. Probably we have not known how to go to work to do this until very recently. But now that we know, in part at least, how to proceed, something still halts the program of social education. It is impossible to say just what this is until we have more investigation of the matter. It may be that various economic interests view with alarm the growing interest in economic and political questions on the part of our masses. It may also be that traditional moral and religious beliefs to some extent are hindering the pursuit of Social

Studies in our schools. Whatever the cause of the arrest in the development of our schemes for social education, we must acknowledge the fact. While statistics are inadequate, from the few that we have it seems certain that the progress of Social Studies in our schools has received a setback within the last half dozen years. The Great War apparently woke the public up to the necessity of such studies, and it is possible that directly after the war a majority of the high school students in the United States were pursuing some Social Studies. It would even seem probable that one-third of them were studying in some degree the problems of government, industry, and social organization. The monograph issued in 1923 by our Federal Bureau of Education on "Status of Certain Social Studies in High School,"[1] written by Harry H. Moore, seemed to show that about twenty-four per cent of American high school students were taking "Civics" and nineteen per cent in addition were taking "Modern Civics"; also ten per cent were taking Economics and three per cent Sociology. These figures were based upon 1,183,058 enrollments in high schools for 1921-22. The Bureau of Education has to date issued no corresponding statistics for more recent years. A recent letter from the Bureau, however, informs the writer that out of a total of 609,893 enrollments in high schools, in 1927-28, 16.52 per cent were in "Civics," 3.25 per cent were in Sociology, and 5.31 per cent were in Economics. Of course it is impossible to draw any certain conclusion from these statistics, as they are too fragmentary. Certain statistics from individual states, however, seem also to indicate that in the high schools the percentage of enrollments in the Social Studies other than history has decreased among high school students rather than increased. We are at least safe in concluding that there has been no considerable increase in the amount of work taken in the Social Studies by our high school students in the United States, though the number of such students has swelled enormously. The ideal of the teachers of the Social Studies that at least one social study should be taken every year by the pupils in American schools from the kindergarten to the end of the high school course seems as far from realization as it did ten years ago.

---

[1] Bulletin No. 45 (1922), published by the Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior.

The reasons for this failure of the Social Studies to take hold are not far to seek. The enormous influx of students into American high schools the last half dozen years or more has been an accompaniment of our prosperity following the Great War. The greater portion of these high school students were undoubtedly seeking vocational training along utilitarian lines. The Social Studies do not readily fit into any scheme of utilitarian vocational education unless it be that of teaching. The materialistic trend, even in high school education, has been as effectual a barrier to the popularity of the Social Studies as the bitterest of their enemies could wish.

Undoubtedly the failure of the Social Studies to advance rapidly in favor in our schools has been in part a consequence also of the reaction which has followed the Great War. The Great War brought an insistent demand in multitudes of American communities for the teaching of patriotism in the schools. The effort to fasten the teaching of patriotism upon the Social Studies has naturally produced a reaction. All that has been said about the danger of Social Studies becoming instruments of partisanship or of conservatism has been too often demonstrated. Thus the picture presented by the efforts to teach the Social Studies in "Middletown," as described to us by Dr. Lynd, are not very encouraging.[2] Among many other stupidities perpetrated in the name of the Social Studies he tells us that the Indiana State Manual for Elementary Schools sets forth the following: "The right of revolution does not exist in America. We had a revolution 140 years ago which made it unnecessary to have any other revolution in this country. . . . One of the many meanings of democracy is that it is a form of government in which the right of revolution has been lost." It is hardly necessary to comment that here is tangible proof of the dangers which may come from social education if it is not rigidly controlled by the scientific spirit.

Perhaps the biggest factor in the failure of the Social Studies in American schools has been the attitude of authorities in our colleges and universities. That many of them have been hostile to all forms of the Social Studies except history is well known. This has been especially true in the older institutions in the East. A former student of mine has written me just recently, "I was never aware of the extent to which we have 'cultural lags' in curricula until I came East." The opposition to Sociology and Anthropology on the part of some college and university authorities has been especially pronounced, although opposition has shown itself at times also to Economics and Political Science. In part this opposition is due to educational traditions, and in part to a social, economic, and political conservatism, which fears the effect of scientific study upon our institutions. But the opposition is also in part a reaction from the way in which the Social Sciences have been developed, especially in leading American universities.

---

[2] *Middletown*, by Robert S. Lynd, p. 198.

What we refer to is the tendency in our higher institutions of learning to develop the Social Sciences as "pure" sciences, not interested in the current problems of our civilization, or as physical sciences, by purely quantitative methods. It may, of course, serve the interests of pure science to divorce the Social Sciences from all concrete questions of social welfare; but it scarcely serves to train teachers for the secondary and elementary schools when this is done. The result is, in the popular mind at least, that the Social Sciences seem divorced from questions of human interest. The same result is, of course, achieved by developing the Social Sciences by physical science methods, methods of quantitative analysis. This may be desirable, so far as it is possible, for the sake of scientific exactness in the social realm; but hardly anything which needs to be given in the way of social education in the secondary schools can be given by such methods. In fact too great emphasis upon such methods effectually sterilizes the Social Sciences for the function of popular guidance.

The net result of these tendencies in the Social Sciences which are just now so strong in our leading institutions of higher learning is that these institutions are scarcely able to function effectively in the training of teachers in the Social Studies in the schools of lower rank. We are not surprised to learn, therefore, that the Social Studies in these schools are "failing to hit the mark" and that "Social Science teachers are making a poor job of it," according to one investigator.[3]

This failure on the part of our institutions to train competent teachers of the Social Studies has naturally given the reactionary forces at work in American society a chance to express themselves. Very numerous arguments are framed by parents and guardians in opposition to the introduction of Social Studies in the schools. These arguments are almost too numerous to mention. Parents object to the theory of evolution, they also object to sex and family problems being discussed, they confuse Sociology with socialism, they are afraid that Economics is opposed to the tariff, that Political Science is favorable to the League of Nations, etc. It is these popular reactions which must in part account for a considerable portion of the teachers of the Social Sciences especially in our institutions of higher learning, seeking refuge in "pure" science, divorced from all questions of social welfare, or in quantitative analyses which seem to place the Social Sciences in a realm almost as transcendent as that of Mathematics. But when this is done in the name of science, another reaction invariably occurs; and that is that people no longer perceive any utility in the Social Studies and avoid them as useless forms of scholarship. It is safe to say therefore that the problem of social education cannot be solved by developing the pure-science attitude or by trying to throw the Social Studies into the same scientific class as the physical sciences and mathematics. If the Social Studies are to avoid all questions concerning which there is partisanship, they will have to avoid all vital problems. Surely the way out cannot be in this negative direction. It must be in raising the Social Studies above partisanship of every sort.

Here, of course, the old question of the place of propaganda in education inevitably arises. We may acknowledge that all forms of education, and especially social education, are necessarily a propaganda for something, even though it be for nothing more than the scientific spirit. In a country with a tax-supported system of public schools many interests will see in these schools opportunities for propaganda. The problem of keeping such schools free from the propaganda of special interests is, therefore, vital for the success of any system of social and political education. It must be admitted that American public schools have not been free from some of the most insidious forms of propaganda, even though they have not been openly and avowedly instruments of propaganda, as the schools have become in both Russia and Italy.

---

[3] For a full account of the progress of the Social Studies in American schools of lower rank the student of education should consult the files of *The Historical Outlook*, especially the issues since 1920.

However, we should not fear propaganda in the schools if it is of the right sort — propaganda for the open-minded love of truth, for the scientific spirit, for the love of right, justice, and fair play, for freedom of thinking, investigation and discussion, and finally for the welfare of humanity and each of its constituent groups. Education, as we have just said, is necessarily propaganda for something. It has been too often a propaganda for the ideas, ideals, and traditions of the past. It can just as easily be made a propaganda for the building of our human world, for the development of all of the essential phases of culture, and for the creation of the completely social man, the man who can function intelligently and helpfully in every social group of which he is a part from the family to humanity. That is social education. Education should be propaganda for these broad principles of successful human living, for the development of culture, for human progress. All experience has shown that there is no narrowing effect in propaganda for such universal human values, and that an education which fails to teach these divorces itself from the real life of men.

But social education should not be propaganda for the particular culture developed by some people. It should not be, for example, a propaganda for either Christianity or democracy, as those terms are ordinarily understood. A democratic society cannot afford to make its schools instruments of a partisan propaganda even for democratic government. They should, of course, study the mechanism of democratic government to understand it; but the higher schools at least should study side by side with democratic government the autocratic systems, letting the truth be manifested in regard to all systems. So, too, with Christianity. The one loyalty of the school must be to the truth. If democracy and Christianity are of value, they need not fear that they will suffer from comparison with other systems. The best propaganda for both Christianity and democracy is to maintain free thinking and free discussion in the schools with the object of discovering the truth. It is the same, of course, with patriotism. We have seen the danger that the teaching of patriotism in our schools may develop into a propaganda for nationalism or for the support of particular acts of government. If, therefore, patriotism is taught in our schools, it must be taught critically, or education will foment, rather than allay, political passions and prejudices. Moreover, if this is not done, factions and parties will always be only too ready to make use of uncritical patriotic instruction for their own purposes.

The conclusion of the whole matter regarding this question of propaganda in our public schools is that propaganda which does not invite the free inquiry and investigation required by the scientific spirit has no place in the schools, not even propaganda for patriotism or public health; for in one sense the schools should not be places for propaganda at all, but places for the discovery of the values of life. Any propaganda therefore which asks for more than a fair field and no favors should be looked on with suspicion. Our schools should not exist to teach orthodoxies in beliefs, whether scientific, political or religious, but to assist in the development of culture and so in the building of our human world. Education should be a propaganda for the development of all those phases of culture which embody necessary values, but as we have just said it dare not be a propaganda for any particular form of these without danger of fettering the human spirit. This is social education at its best, the building up of those attitudes in the masses of individuals which are favorable to the highest development of culture and the production of the fully social man. It is social education in this sense which must be the instrument of transforming our relatively ignorant, brutal, and barbarous human world into a relatively enlightened, humane, and civilized society. But if such social education is to prevail in our schools, the dictation of factions, parties, and even communities must cease. The schools cannot be treated like a restaurant where you can order any sort of course that you choose. The schools must in some way or other escape not only from the tyranny of vested interests and religious sects, but even from the tyranny of custom itself.

Now this ideal of a free school in a free state is quite alien to the American people. Strangely enough, the American people have been willing to give entire freedom to the church, and this is one of their great achievements in culture. It has been clearly seen, in theory at least, that churches must not be dictated to by vested interests, political parties, or even by social customs. The church has been free to follow its own conscience, or at least such theoretical freedom has been given to it. But it is not so with the schools. Our schools are not free any more than those of European peoples. Hence they cannot function properly in the higher sort of social education which we are trying to describe. We do not, of course, wish the schools freed from the domination of human interests and of the social spirit. To free them to that extent would be to make them mere instruments of individual development, and agencies in promoting social dissolution and anarchy. But when the schools are under the dictation of local communities, of local customs, of political parties, or of sectarian interests, they cannot perform their function of bringing to bear rational, intelligent criticism upon our civilization. In other words, they cannot become instruments of social progress. They become, on the contrary, the upholders of a social order which will soon be outgrown.

Freedom of teaching and thinking cannot be maintained in our schools, let us be careful to note, unless it is maintained to some extent in society at large. The schools are not, and cannot be made, the only instrument of social education. Indeed, many would question whether they can or should be made the chief means of educating the citizen along social and political lines. However, we shall assume that they are the chief means of social education in our complex society for the young; that the schools are no longer a mere auxiliary institution in social education; but by virtue of our historical, cultural development have become the center of all educational influences at work in our society, including those for social education. But it is important to note that any proper scheme for the development of social education in the schools presupposes freedom of speech, of discussion, and of assemblage in society at large. Discussion is a sort of form of social education, and indeed it is the chief form of adult education along social and political lines. Where freedom of discussion is inhibited, either through restrictions on freedom of the press or freedom of assemblage, social education can accomplish little. Indeed, the social and political education in our schools looks forward to the individual's participation in adult life in the various discussion processes which help to form the opinion of his group upon public questions. We must not, therefore, think of the education of the schools as something separate from the work of the press, the public forum, and the pulpit. The whole object of social education is at bottom to make intelligent self-government and self-determination possible in the community, the state, the nation, and the world. We can perhaps build relatively successful individual careers without social education; but we cannot build a successful democratic nation or a peaceful human world without such education, or even without making it central in the work of our schools.

The next step in education must be, accordingly, the humanizing and socializing of our schools. The schools must take upon themselves the responsibilities of leadership in civilization. They must be emancipated from the paralyzing worship of the past and from the equally paralyzing thraldom to material interests. No doubt the past must continue to be studied and even to be emphasized for the sake of understanding the present and the possibilities of the future. There is no doubt also that the physical sciences and the conquest of physical nature through various skills and technologies must continue to be emphasized in our educational system, since material achievement is to some extent an indispensable basis for the development of any higher spiritual culture. But the central thing in our educational system must be made the adjustment of individuals and groups to one another, or the building of our human world in its social aspects. All our conquests of physical nature and all of our scholarship in the lore of the past will avail us but little if we cannot harmonize human relations.

Little will be accomplished toward the humanization and socialization of our education by the present vogue for vocational education. Vocational education aims at a very narrow segment of the problem of social adjustment, and that is the getting of a livelihood. Its aim is to produce the efficient farmer, efficient engineer, business man, physician, lawyer, etc. Its aim is strictly in accord with the primacy of the physical sciences in education and with the general materialistic trend of our schools. It scarcely aims at producing the good citizen, the fully rational and social man who can help to build a culture which embodies in the highest degree the true, the good, and the beautiful. There is little or no assurance of good citizenship in vocational training, as ordinarily conceived and carried out. A man may be efficient in some occupation and yet quite lacking in social intelligence, in a sense of social honor, and in public spirit.

As nearly as the aims or objectives of social education can be compressed into a formula, they have just been expressed in these three qualities: social intelligence, a sense of social honor, and public spirit. Very obviously these qualities cannot be developed in the young without the explicit teaching of social information and of social values. It is true that much more is involved in all of these than the study of books. Wherever practical activities can be employed, they should of course be employed. Nevertheless the Social Studies, in the sense in which those words are usually employed, namely, history, anthropology, sociology, economics, political science and social ethics, are central in any rational scheme of social education.

The Social Studies are central in social education because if social education is to aim at social intelligence it must be based on social information. The greatest difficulty perhaps in the way of harmonizing human relations in our world is the general ignorance which human individuals and groups at the present time have of one another. This ignorance leads to isolation, suspicion, misunderstandings, and hatred. It is as dangerous as dynamite in our complex civilization and must be replaced by knowledge of our human world. Already this social ignorance has cost our present world more than any other form of ignorance. We cannot live rightly with other people without social intelligence, and we cannot have social intelligence without having information about other social groups than our own and the conditions under which they live. The American citizen must know something of the life of European peoples and the conditions under which they live before he can be just to them. The white man must know something about the negro and the conditions under which he lives before he can be just to the negro. If our democracy is not to be the rule of ignorance, ample and accurate information concerning our human world must be given to the whole mass of our citizens. The Social Studies represent the problems with which these citizens must deal, and they must have enough information along these lines to be fairly intelligent concerning these problems, and especially to be able to discriminate the expert in these lines from the demagogue.

The Social Studies will do much more than merely impart information along historical, economic, political and social lines. They will stimulate and develop the social imagination of the young. Through them the individual will learn to live a little less in his own narrow provincial world, and a little more in the great human world of the present. Social imagination is the basis of good morals and of all correct conduct in our world. The good citizen must learn to identify himself in imagination with all men everywhere. Much more may be involved in the education of the imagination than storing the mind with social information; but the imagination cannot work without information and in general the more we have of it and the more accurately it is imparted, the more development we shall get of social imagination. Fundamental information concerning our human world, then, is the gateway to good citizenship, and indeed to all the higher social culture. Right social action, and therefore true progress, is impossible without right social information. The content of the curriculum in our schools is, therefore, of supreme importance; and it is no mere caprice which has led the teachers of the Social Studies to demand from one-fourth to one-third of the student's time from the kindergarten to the end of the A.B. course for the imparting of ample and accurate information concerning our human world.

If all of this is done in the true scientific spirit with the object not of biasing the student's mind but of helping him to understand his human world, there can be no doubt that the best thing has been done which the schools can do to emancipate the mind of the student and at the same time to educate him into impartiality in his attitudes toward other groups than his own. This giving of scientific social information to the student is probably the best means of getting rid of the petty narrowness and prejudices with which almost all of the young are brought up, or at least to which they are exposed. Moreover, if the student is taught to think rightly concerning social facts, as social facts are always laden so heavily with emotional tones, there can hardly be any doubt that the student will receive training in right thinking such as few other disciplines can give. He may thus catch the spirit of science from the Social Studies just as well as from the physical sciences. The scientific spirit, even more than scientific facts and conclusions, is a precious element in all education and especially in social education.

But social education must not stop with the giving of mere information about our human world, important as that may be. It must seek to inculcate correct social values. This is, indeed, the heart of social education. If it does not help the individual to discover true social values, it will largely be vain. The social scientists who are trying to divorce the Social Studies from all questions of value are doing nothing less than sterilizing those studies. Questions of value are indeed so unsettled in our world that one can easily understand why some students of society, in the name of "pure" science, advocate that the social studies should abstain from all social and moral valuations. Yet such an attitude is not only childish and puerile, it is impossible. We cannot study any social problem thoroughly without perceiving the relative social values that are clearly implied in the situation. Thus when we study thoroughly, for example, the use of narcotics in human society, we are in position to see what a reasonable social standard regarding their use should be, even though the actual social standard may be very different. This illustration is sufficient to show that value-judgments are and should be closely correlated with fact-judgments. Indeed, it is characteristic of the youth of the present age that it asks for the facts behind our value-judgments. No social education will be a success which will not meet this reasonable demand. The whole instruction in the Social Studies should be shot through with social ethics if we wish such social education to be effective in building social character.

Here of course the moral agnosticism of our age challenges the whole program of social education. It says, in effect, that we have no right to teach social values in our schools; that if we do not wish human society to become fossilized in the morals of the present or the past, we should leave individuals to form their own value-judgments. The obvious reply is that the young are not fitted to reach these value-judgments without some aid from their teachers, even if they have the facts before them. Purely inductive study of human institutions and morals is not yet a pedagogical success, and it is doubtful if it ever can be. The human mind, even the scientific mind, cannot work purely by induction. The clear indications of social facts and conditions should be pointed out by the teacher to the student. This does not mean that social education needs to be in any sense dogmatic. It is the experience of mankind, of history, of society, to which the teacher in the Social Sciences necessarily appeals. That experience has clearly shown that men cannot live successfully together without the observance of certain principles or rules which favor coöperation and the development of community life. Social honor is one of these principles to which we have already referred. Without some degree of social honor men have found that they cannot coöperate, because they cannot rely upon one another. Again, communities have found that only by fostering public spirit (which is probably but another name for an unselfish attitude on the part of the individual toward his community) can the community prosper, especially in its political life. It is surely time that our schools lay aside their moral indifference sufficiently to try to inculcate into their students a sense of social honor and public spirit. Stark individualism has been tolerated in our public schools too long. There would seem to be but little danger of moral conservatism or dogmatism resulting from the inculcation of such broad ethical principles as social honor and public spirit. Even a little impartation of these principles in the pupils of our public schools might save the nation a great deal of corruption and crime. Yet only indirectly, as a rule, through the activities of the school, and then most ineffectively, are these principles inculcated. There is no reason why they should not be imparted from the facts of history, sociology, economics and political science. Indeed, the teacher who ignores all social values in teaching these subjects is simply ignoring a part of his facts. Social values are as much the subject matter of the Social Sciences as any other facts.

It follows of course that any social education which is adequate is moral education. The good citizen is the moral citizen, and there is no evading this issue. Moreover, to say that moral principles cannot be taught in our schools is as stupid as it would be to say that vocational principles cannot be taught. It is just as possible to teach the moral virtues as it is vocational skills, and they are taught largely in the same way, by enlisting the student's intelligence, interest, imagination, and will. If possible, of course, these social principles should be taught by practice; and in the average school and its adjacent community there is usually opportunity to practice vital social principles. Social values, however, do not need to be taught in a dogmatic or absolute manner in our public schools. That is against the whole spirit of science. They are to be taught like any other judgments, as experimental conclusions. If we find it possible to give vocational education which results in the highest skill on such a basis, we should also find it possible to give social and moral education on the same basis.

The refusal of educators to embark upon such a project of social education as we have outlined, for all of our youth is difficult to understand. It is not only difficult to understand, but it does not speak well for the social vision of educators. The present condition of humanity is driving all nations rapidly toward some such scheme of social education, or else it is driving civilization itself upon the rocks. Democracy is impossible without the minimum of social and political education which we have sketched. Even such problems as crime and the demoralization of the home cannot be solved without such education. If we leave the masses longer without some degree of social education, we must expect catastrophe. Gradually this is being perceived, and we are fond of citing Mr. Wells to the effect that our civilization is a race between education and catastrophe. However, most of the people who quote Mr. Wells do not see that there are many sorts of education which will not save civilization from catastrophe. So far as we know, there is no assurance that education in the classics, in the languages, in the physical sciences, and in materialistic vocations will have any saving power. It is only social, political, and moral education which can save our civilization from catastrophe, and this is precisely the kind of education which we are neglecting.

It will be said that such education cannot be given except through religion. I would be among the last to deny that education given from the religious point of view can help very much in social education. Probably the churches can teach social and moral principles more effectively than the schools ever can, because they often teach them from an absolute point of view. The coöperation of the church and the school must therefore be sought in social education. We have already emphasized the mistake of treating the school and the education of the young as something entirely separate from the rest of society. Nevertheless, it should also be remembered that the kind of social education which socializes the intelligence and character, the emotions and values, of individuals is not far from a religious education. It has been well said that the education and training whose end is tolerance and coöperation are religious in nature; and this is also social education. We may well quote Professor Cooley again when he tells us that "The higher social culture is of a kindred spirit with religion." Education into the appreciation of human values and human service is therefore in a broad sense religious; and if such social education could be introduced into our schools, the problem of religious education for the churches would be greatly simplified.

There is nothing, therefore, about the problem of social education which is insoluble. Of course, adequate social education cannot be provided in our schools without adequately trained teachers who are themselves socially intelligent, socially minded, and public spirited. It is the business of the teacher-training schools, the colleges, and the universities to furnish our schools with such teachers. They have readily enough furnished teachers to train pupils along materialistic lines. We need only to awaken to the spiritual needs of our civilization in order to use the school as an agency of true social progress, as a means of creating the fully rational and social personalities which our human world must have if its future is to be secure.

13

John Dewey

PHILOSOPHY AND EDUCATION

13

PHILOSOPHY AND EDUCATION[1]

John Dewey

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

AFTER a period in Greece in which inquiry was devoted to inquiry into nature, with man subordinated, philosophy turned in Athens to the study of Man. Socrates, as the saying goes, brought philosophy down from the heavens to earth. It is often forgotten that this change coincided with an interest in education; it was indeed an outgrowth of interest in the possibilities of education in its large sense. This fact is concealed from view because the fundamental inquiry of Socrates, the discussion that gave birth to Plato and Aristotle, appear in English translation as: Can virtue be taught? When we hear the word "virtue" we think of something marked from other human interests and traits in a moralistic way. But the Greek word that is translated "virtue" was immensely wider in its scope. Its original meaning was close to the idea of valor, manliness. Then it became broadened to signify all those qualities that render a human admirable in himself and a loyal and effective member of his community.

The question of whether virtue can be taught was a question of whether it is possible by deliberate and planned means to implant in raw human nature those characteristics which make the individual worthy; which instill in him an active love of the good, and which equip him with powers to serve his society. It was admitted that certain skills may be acquired; the training of apprentices in the arts and crafts was evidence of that fact. It was admitted that information could be conveyed on special matters, and individuals be supplied with the knowledge necessary to enable them to take part in the special callings of shoemaker, carpenter or physician. But this training, this inculcation of information fell short of education. Could manhood in its full sense be systematically taught? For excellence of manhood meant the transformation of crude and animal traits of human nature into a realized possession of reason and rational ideals; into comprehension and enjoyment of science and fine art. Could the unruly appetites and irregular impulses of the natural, quasi-animal, man be converted into the intelligent habits of obedience and of leadership that were the conditions of a stable and happy community life?

---

[1] This essay is reprinted, with slight changes made by Mr. Dewey himself, from a Volume of Addresses printed by the University of California Press and originally delivered at the occasion of the dedication of the new campus and buildings of the University of California at Los Angeles, on March 28, 1930. Reprinted by permission of the President of the University of California.

The query was the most searching that man has ever put to himself. Is education really possible means: Is it possible to apply intelligence intentionally and systematically to the regulation of life? Is human nature such that it has the capacity for being led along directed paths into any assured realization of all its desirable capacities? Are there any who are wise enough to educate? Are there ends and principles upon which they may depend in attempting the controlled development of others? And, on the other side, is human nature such that it lends itself to, that it is capable of, education into personal and social excellence?

Because the query is so searching and so fundamental, it led into the raising of almost all the problems with which European philosophy since the time of the great Athenians has concerned itself. What is knowledge? What is its relation to being and to truth? What is the connection between knowledge of the good and its practice? What is mind and what is its relation to the body? What connection is there between thought and understanding and appetite and emotion? What is the Good and how is it apprehended? Can it be efficaciously communicated? How, that is, can the individual be led to participate in it so that it may regulate his life? Can it be communicated to individuals except in a just social order? And the latter question brought up the whole problem of the relation of the individual and the social to each other, the problem of social organization, law and authority.

I have no intention of discussing these philosophical issues. I have referred to them to indicate how vitally connected was the origin of philosophy with the beginning of conscious attention to education. The educational enterprise was taken seriously. It was regarded as the systematic means by which the good life was to be arrived at and maintained: the life full, excellent, rich, for the individual center of that life, and the life good for the community of which the individual was a member. I emphasize this view of education as the deliberate initiation and cultivation of the good life because it indicates so clearly the defects of so many views about education which have since come to prevail. As has been said, the possibility of training for skill in specalized callings was not questioned; the possibility of conveying successfully specific bodies of information was not questioned. But it was implicitly denied that these processes define genuine education. The goal and scope of education was extended to include whatever contributes to the purposeful developments of the good life, and it was limited to include only what serves this end and meets the tests which it imposes.

An illustration is found in the contention of Socrates and Plato that knowledge is a condition of excellence, that to know the good and to do it are inevitably connected together, that ignorance and spiritual failure, the bad life, are intimately associated. This view has been constantly criticized on the ground that it immensely exaggerates the importance of intellect and knowledge, since experience shows that although men know what is good they do not act in accordance with their knowledge. These adverse criticisms overlook the fact that the Socratic position cuts both ways. It sets forth a criterion for knowledge as well as for right conduct. Plato's answer to the critics would be, I take it, that knowledge which does not pass into action according to what is known is *not* knowledge; it is opinion, hearsay, a second-hand acceptance of ideas advanced by others. The measure of knowledge, we can imagine him saying, is precisely the action it does arouse and direct. To the charge that he exaggerated the importance of intelligence and underrated that of practice, skill, habit and the emotions, he might reply by pointing out that he made a prolonged and severe exercise in deeds, and a systematic training of the affections, of likes and dislikes a precondition of the manifestation of that intelligence which is capable of realizing the good. He might point to the fact that the training of the body and its habits and skills which he called gymnastic and of the emotions by means of what he termed music were necessary preliminaries of insight into the structure and principles of the Good Life. Admitting that the content of what he called gymnastic has now been extended to include forms of technical skill, like those required in various vocations, which he did not contemplate; and that the content of what he termed music has been enlarged to cover all forms of literature and the fine arts, Plato might still ask a question. Has not the gain in quantity, in extent, been accompanied by a loss in quality? For in cutting off the modes of special and professional training and of æsthetic cultivation from their connection with the supreme value of the Good Life and intimate knowledge of it, we have, he would argue, made them ends in themselves and have thereby lost the clue to the educational use to be made of them, the inclusive end to which they ought to contribute.

It is not the technical correctness of Plato's theory that I am concerned with. What his theory proves is that education was thought of as the means of the institution of the good life among men. Philosophy was the study of the nature of this Good Life, of its constituents and of the conditions of its realization. Philosophy and education were organically connected.

The vital bond of union has long since been broken. Education, schooling, goes its way, and philosophy pursues an independent path. Both education and philosophy have found a multitude of special problems with which each has to occupy itself, and, in this specialization of both, the two have grown apart. The Greek scene was comparatively simple and unified.

Ours is complex and diversified. There are many things, too many things, to be done, and these numerous things seem so different from one another that there is no unifying bond among them. Each of these many and different things is difficult to accomplish; each takes all the time and strength one has to give. Thought and attention have been diverted to details, and the sense of the encompassing whole has been blurred and often lost. Yet this very situation may be viewed as a call to restore the lost connection of serious thought upon the problems of life with the work of education. There is to-day a great and growing interest in education. In the last generation, it has become a distinctive university study. Interest in philosophic thought is on the increase. Would not a reunion aid in giving direction and wholeness to education and solidity and vitality to philosophy?

In one thing at least our condition is similar to that of the Athenians. After a long period in which education was treated as a matter of routine experience, tradition and mere apprenticeship, we are engaged once more in regarding education as a pursuit having intellectual foundations, and needing systematic intellectual guidance. Our university departments of education are proof of this fact. We are no longer content to permit the work of teaching and discipline to take care of itself on the basis of precedent and of unexamined models bequeathed from the past. Nor are we satisfied to treat them as matters of purely personal gifts and inspiration, reënforced by mastery of special subject-matters. School organization was once an affair of factors derived from tradition and political administration. Superintendents and principals followed precedents modified by the demands of school boards and taxpayers. There was not the knowlege in psychology and related branches to take instruction out of the rule of routine influenced only by personal endowments; and there was not the knowledge in economics, statistics and related social sciences to introduce a measure of scientific control into school organization and administration.

In the minds of those habituated to such undeveloped conditions there was something presumptuous and futile in attempting the introduction of the study of education into higher institutions of learning. It was well enough to have normal schools in which young people, green at their task, should be initiated into the tricks of their trade; in which in addition to learning something more about subjects to be taught they should acquire some information and get exercise in the methods and devices which teachers before them had worked out in the course of accumulated experience. But why introduce such a matter into a university devoted to the dissemination of old knowledge and the discovery of new? It is a matter of familiar experience that older and better established departments in our higher institutions of learning looked askance upon the introduction of something called pedagogy, with the rather contemptuous associations that attend that word.

Being new, "education" as a subject of university teaching and study was necessarily comparatively unorganized. The pioneers had to grope their way. It would be foolish to claim that no mistakes were made, or that they do not continue to be made. But wholesale condemnation of the enterprise overlooks two fundamental facts. One is that education is the largest and most important undertaking of the organized political state and community; the largest in personnel and in expenditures, as well as, one may say without exaggeration, the most fundamentally important of all branches of public activity in its results. (It is not surprising therefore that upon the whole state universities have been most receptive to the claims of the new discipline.) This is only one side of the picture. The need might be there, and yet there be no intellectual resources capable of meeting it. But hostile critics overlooked the fact that the growth of other subjects of study had reached a point where they had valuable material to contribute to the solution of problems that arise in the school system; something to contribute to a wiser direction of the work the schools have to accomplish. There now exists not only a wealth, an almost appalling variety, of problems to be studied, but there exists also a wealth of material drawn from many special topics which can be organized and brought to bear upon these questions.

Let me suggest as an illustration one field somewhat remote from my own personal interests; the field of educational organization and administration. We have not in this country and many of us hope we shall never have, a highly centralized governmental school of regulation and supervision. Yet some kind of intellectual oversight and direction is needed, unless there is to be mere drift and waste. Our traditions commit us to some kind of voluntary control, of voluntary dissemination and acceptance. The universities are the natural centers for providing what is needed. At once, a multitude of problems offer themselves. The school is at least one great social institution among others and an institution having with us a legal basis and a political connection. The history of this institution is at least as worthy of study as is the history of any other institution. Its present forms and operations call for the same careful examination as those of any other institution. Political science, sociology, economics, public health, are involved in any directed study of the problems that arise. They supply the intellectual capital with which the problems must be approached. Many mistakes occur, much waste exists, many failures accrue, because the affairs of public education are conducted without the light which such subjects as those just mentioned could shed. The university is not only the logical place for the organization of knowledge with respect to the public problems but it is the only place where it can be carried on.

I have mentioned one phase of the opportunity and need. Were one to consider the problem of the course of study from the elementary through the high school, taking into account the rapid multiplication of subjects and sciences leading to superficiality and congestion, there would be presented to our consideration an even more fertile field for university study. To mention only one aspect of this complex subject: There is as yet no widely accepted approximation to a solution of the question of the organized adaptation of the older traditional studies to those which have found their ways into the schools in the last generation or so. Everywhere in life there is conflict of the old and traditional with the new and resultant confusion. This conflict is nowhere more acute than in education, and nowhere are the consequences of confusion more harmful. Universities are sufficiently far away from the immediate and daily scene to take up this question in a thorough-going way, while they may and should be in close enough connection with schools to obtain the material necessary to deal with it. Without serious and consecutive study at an intellectual center, we are in great danger of impairing the efficacy of education by yielding on one hand to a ballyhoo of glorification of anything and everything as long as it is new and different, and on the other of becoming hampered by reactionary economic and social forces, so that we content ourselves with adherence to the old in the face of radically new conditions.

One other point demands attention, if only in passing. The extension of knowledge in recent years bearing upon the treatment of individuals is enormous. It includes not only what is conventionally covered by "instruction and discipline" but all that affects the mental and moral well-being of teachers and pupils. Physiology, psychology, psychiatry, child clinics, institutes of child guidance, have provided unexpected and as yet largely unassimilated material which is needed to deal with this pressing matter. The coördination of this material in its distinctive bearing upon the questions of normal and abnormal development of persons is a distinctive problem. It cannot safely be left until disorders have set in requiring to be treated by remedial measures. What is needed is constructive and preventive action; the school as well as the home is the natural place for such action; the teacher with the parent is the agent for conducting it. But teachers and parents are helpless without knowledge which is organized with reference to education instead of with reference to cure. Professional schools are recognized as legitimate parts of university teaching and research. Yet education is the one profession whose direct aim is constructive, and which is concerned with development of normal persons, instead of dealing with cases of dislocation and breakdown, personal and social.

All this, however, does not say anything about the relation of philosophy and education in university teaching. That interest in education was the parent of philosophical questions may be admitted and yet it may be held that the two have now parted company as parent and child so often do. To admit that they have permanently separated is, however, to concede that education is now concerned with specialized and technical matters, not with the Good Life. That education in its preoccupation with a multitude of special matters that require attention has often been more concerned with inculcating special skills, whether the formal studies of the primary school or the professional abilities of later life, and more concerned with the impartation of bodies of information than with the problem of creating conditions for the experience of values, is doubtless true. It is true also that knowledge has become so specialized and subdivided that its unity has become dissipated. But unless we assume that these results are necessary and right, this very situation is that which creates a demand for philosophy which meets it with a challenge.

Some years ago Professor John M. Coulter, himself a highly successful teacher, spoke of education in the following terms: "There is no problem concerning which we can so ill afford to be dogmatic; and no one concerning which we are so dogmatically inclined. There is no question concerning which past experience may be so unsafe a guide, since what we have attained cannot be compared with what we hope for and have a right to expect. There is no problem concerning which theorizing may lead so far astray, and none which has been so covered with crude theorizing. We do not understand the structure we are seeking to modify and develop; we do not know what we want to do for it when we shall understand it, and we do not know how to accomplish when we shall know what we want. Out of this mass of negations we are constructing our hypotheses." We are not, in other words, as far removed from the time of Socrates and Plato in insight as we are in years, or as the multiplication of agencies of instruction might seem to indicate. We still have to raise the question whether education is possible and if so how. For education is still the formation of character, intellectual, moral and æsthetic, and not just training in skills and the impartation of information. And what, in detail, the development of a good character signifies and how it is to be intelligently directed are still matters of doubt and debate.

I would not seem to suggest that philosophy has a ready-made answer to these questions. But I am quite sure that the problem is one for philosophy to consider and that education proposes to philosophy questions which challenge all its resources and which test all its theories. If philosophy is to come forth from a closeted seclusion and submit to the test of application, the problems of education furnish it with its most direct and most urgent opportunity.

For the ultimate aim of education is nothing other than the creation of human beings in the fullness of their capacities. Through the making of human beings, of men and women generous in aspiration, liberal in thought, cultivated in taste, and equipped with knowledge and competent method, society itself is constantly remade, and with this remaking the world itself is re-created. We need not be reminded either that society is in rapid change or that present life is ripe with unsolved issues and infected with evils. But it is well to remind ourselves from time to time that education is the most far-reaching and the most fundamental way of correcting social evils and meeting social issues. With all our great American faith in education, we are still given to supposing that external reforms can cope with our troubles. We look for some legislative scheme, some twist given to institutions, to do the work that can only be done by individual men and women, and that can be done by them only as they are themselves developed into full possession of all their potentialities. I do not believe that any one can accurately predict what the future will bring forth or set up adequate ideals of future society. But in the degree in which education develops individuals into mastery of their own capacities, we must trust these individuals to meet issues as they arise, and to remake the social conditions they face into something worthier of man and of life.

How often in the past have we depended upon war to bring out the supreme loyalties of mankind. Its life and death struggles are obvious and dramatic; its results in changing the course of history are evident and striking. When shall we realize that in every school building in the land a struggle is also being waged against all that hems in and distorts human life? The struggle is not with arms and violence; its consequences cannot be recorded in statistics of the physically killed and wounded, nor set forth in terms of territorial changes. But in its slow and imperceptible processes, the real battles for human freedom and for the pushing back of the boundaries that restrict human life are ultimately won. We need to pledge ourselves to engage anew and with renewed faith in the greatest of all battles in the cause of human liberation, to the end that all human beings may lead the life that is alone worthy of being entitled wholly human.

PART FOUR

AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF NEW VENTURES

14

Alexander Meiklejohn

PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION IN THE LIBERAL COLLEGE

14

PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION IN THE LIBERAL COLLEGE[1]

Alexander Meiklejohn

PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY AND CHAIRMAN OF THE
EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
[FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF AMHERST COLLEGE]

AT the annual meeting of the Progressive Education Association in the year 1928 John Dewey spoke on "*The Next Step in Progressive Education.*" His words on that occasion seem to me quite primary in their importance and their urgency. They are the words of a leader of a movement. To that movement in this country Mr. Dewey gave an initial impulse; in all its development he has been a directing and inspiring force. I presume that he understands it better than any one else. It was fitting, therefore, that at an annual meeting he should proceed to examine the achievements of progressive education; should attempt once more to formulate its principles, should try to chart its course thus far, and should then go on to ask the question, What next and to what end?

Now it is to that question as formulated by Mr. Dewey that I wish to direct the argument of this paper. It is essential that those of us who call ourselves Progressives in education should try to determine in what direction our progress is leading. There can be no doubt that the schools in which we work are happy and exciting places for teachers as well as students. There can be little question that in those schools strong and sane and wholesome human impulses are at work. But these things are not enough. All human enterprises must be studied. They must be seen in relation to other enterprises which serve the same or related ends. It would be strange indeed if the enterprises of learning and teaching should alone escape this necessity of self-examination. I ask you therefore to join with me in trying to answer Mr. Dewey's question, What next, and to what end are our schools progressing?

---

[1] This essay, in slightly changed form, was delivered by Professor Meiklejohn at the 1929 meeting of the Progressive Education Association and is used here by permission of the officers of this national Association.

I would not have any one think that I approach this task with confidence or light-heartedness. It is characteristic of Mr. Dewey's mind to be traveling where travel is difficult. One finds him at work where roads are rough, where new ground must be broken, where new inventions are needed. And it would perhaps be the better part of valor if we left the problem as he has stated it, if we waited to follow the road when he and his fellows have made it plain. That is what prudence advises. And for me personally there are two special reasons to which a cautious person might well give heed. In the first place, I am, at least so far as practice goes, a novice in the field of Progressive education. Only within the last two years, since leaving the East and coming to the West, have I had a chance to try the newer ways of teaching of which I had dreamed. I need hardly say that the experience has been both exciting and bewildering; I had never imagined that teaching could go so fast, nor present so many dilemmas. And so it is out of the breathlessness and bewilderment of a new experience that I must make my way to the point to which Mr. Dewey summons us.

A second difficulty is even more serious. I am quite certain that Mr. Dewey will not like the words and phrases in which I try to state his meaning. Already, if he could see what I am writing (I am sure), he would be shaking his head sadly over my preliminary formulation of his question. "To what End?" I quoted him as saying. And already he is correcting "Not End, but Ends." For Mr. Dewey does not like Unities and Absolutes and Universals — and I adore them. In many different places in the realms of experience and thought he has found them false and harmful and mischievous. And so continually you will find him berating and attacking them. And on the other hand, my trouble is that I never can get a statement made that seems worth making except by means of absolutes and unities and universals. I hardly seem to be well qualified to serve as his reporter or his messenger. And yet in spite of this I must go on. We have a common interest and a common problem. He wants to know how teaching can be done — and so do I. He puts his faith in ways which people call progressive — and so do I. He finds progressive teaching facing an issue which calls for clarity of mind, for careful gathering and sifting of the facts — and so do I. No matter what our views of ultimates or lack of ultimates, the presence or absence of universal laws or tests or standards, we both are eager to get better teaching done. In 1928 he singled out a point at which advances may be made and summoned his friends to join in the attack. And just because I too would like to make a fight against the common foe at that same point I venture to take my place among the answerers to the call.

Mr. Dewey states his question by contrasting two phases in the development of progressive education. The first of these is, he tells us, just now ending. The second is, or ought to be, about to begin. The first phase has been largely negative; the second must be positive and constructive. The attitude of the first period has been one of protest, of deviation, of innovation. Teachers have found the formality and fixity of the traditional schools oppressive and restrictive. They have therefore sought for freedom as the removal of artificial and benumbing restrictions. But, continues Mr. Dewey, removal, abolition are negative; so in time it comes to be seen that such freedom is no end in itself — nothing to be satisfied with and to stay by — but marks at most an opportunity to do something of a positive and constructive sort.

Now it is in terms of a certain demand which he is making that Mr. Dewey draws the contrast between these two periods. He is distinguishing practice from theory and it is especially with respect to theory that he calls the first phase negative. In that period, he tells us, the progressive schools have by their procedures established a common spirit and purpose which marks them off from the traditional schools. But in the second period he ventures the hope that "out of the coöperative undertakings of the various schools a coherent body of educational principles shall gradually emerge as a distinctive contribution to the theory of education." If we can see clearly just what is this separation of contribution in spirit and purpose from contribution in theory, we shall have reached the formulation of the question which I wish to discuss in this paper.

The first of these phases Mr. Dewey explains by listing a number of attitudes which he finds characteristic of the progressive schools. They "exhibit as compared with traditional schools a common emphasis upon respect for individuality and for increased freedom, a common disposition to build upon the experience and nature of the boys and girls that come to them, instead of imposing from without external subject matter and standards. They all display a certain atmosphere of informality, because experience has proved that formalization is hostile to genuine mental activity and to sincere intellectual growth. Emphasis upon activity as distinct from passivity is one of the common factors. And again I assume that there is in all these schools a common unusual attention to the human factors, to normal social relations, to communication and intercourse which is like in kind to that which is found in the great world beyond the school doors: that all alike believe that these normal human contacts of child with child and of child with teacher are of supreme educational importance, and that all alike disbelieve in those artificial personal relations which have been the chief factor in the isolation of schools from life. So much at least of common spirit and purpose we may assume to exist." This is, I take it, the achievement of the first phase of progressive education.

As we turn to the second phase, that of theory, Mr. Dewey notes at once that the achievement of the first is not to be ignored. "These ideas," he says, "constitute no mean contribution; it is a contribution to educational theory as well as to the happiness and integrity of those who come under the influence of progressive schools. But the elements of the contribution are general, and, like all generalities, subject to various and ambiguous interpretations. They indicate the starting-point of the contribution that progressive schools may make to the theory or science of education, but only the starting-point." What then, as clearly as we can state it, is that other task, the theoretical inquiry toward which the past achievements of the progressive schools now point the way? Mr. Dewey defines the task in a number of telling phrases. "Experience has proved," he says, "that they (the schools) give a good account of themselves: so it has seemed to me that the present is a fitting time to raise the intellectual, the theoretical, problem of the relation of the progressive movement to the art and philosophy of education." And again, he urges, "One thing is sure, in the degree in which they enter upon organized constructive work, they (the schools) are bound to make definite contributions to building up the theoretical or intellectual side of education. Whether this be called science, or philosophy of education, I for one care little; but if they do not *intellectually* organize their own work, while they may do much in making the lives of the children committed to them more joyous and more vital, they will contribute only incidental scraps to the science of education."

Now what does it mean to "intellectually organize" one's teaching? What do you do to teaching when you make a science or a philosophy of it? If only we could make those phrases clear, our problem would at last be stated.

It is characteristic of Mr. Dewey's general procedure that he defines his idea by giving specific cases of its application, rather than by using other abstract ideas. In this case he makes two concrete suggestions to teachers who wish to be scientific. First they should see to it that the contents of a pupil's study are not merely "a succession of unrelated activities" but rather that all its incidents are "brought within the scope of a developing whole of content and purpose, which is a whole because it has continuity and consecutiveness in its parts." And second, teachers must study the conditions favorable to learning, must find out how to bring to bear upon the pupil such influences that study and learning will naturally take place. It is interesting to see that in both these cases Mr. Dewey is indicating that mere dependence upon the interest of the student, upon his own direction of his activities, is not enough. In some sense the teacher must guide and direct and arrange in order to make sure that the work has coherence and direction. With regard to the second of these suggestions Mr. Dewey says very little, merely explaining it in his final summary. It is the first of the suggestions with which his argument is chiefly concerned, and here we find our own problem. I will try as quickly as I can to bring it to exact statement.

Mr. Dewey states his issue by opposing, as it were, the teacher and the pupil. The progressive school, as every one knows, exalts the pupil; it cherishes his individual freedom, his initiative, his self-direction. And Mr. Dewey has stated in quite unmistakable terms his acceptance of this attitude. And yet he is facing a difficulty. If in our arrangements the individual students are left free to follow their own devices, what assurance, he asks, is there that what they do is anything more than the expression, and exhaustion, of a momentary impulse and interest? A mere "succession of unrelated activities," he says, "does not provide, of course, the opportunity or content of building up an organized subject-matter." Nor does it "provide for the development of a coherent and integrated self." "Bare doing," he adds, "is not enough." It is necessary, therefore, that the teacher take charge of the situation: He must direct the pupil, must plan the course of study, must give to all the learning of the students a relevance and orderliness which it could not otherwise achieve. It is true, says Mr. Dewey, that the impulse to study this or that, "the start, the first move, the initial impulse in action, must proceed from the pupil. . . . But whence comes the idea of *what* to do? That . . . comes as a suggestion from beyond himself, from the environment, he being not an originator of the idea and purpose but a vehicle through which his surroundings past and present suggest something to him." What, then, is the task of the teacher? It is obviously to create the environment, to determine the surroundings so that they will furnish and maintain the right suggestion. Progressive teachers may not impose tasks upon their pupils, but they may, they must, suggest them. They may and can work out and present to other teachers for trial and criticism definite and organized bodies of knowledge, together with a listing of sources from which additional information of the same sort can be secured. Such lists, with the proper testing of their values in practice, are the chief contribution which Mr. Dewey asks from the progressive teachers as they proceed to bring their work to the level of intellectual organization.

Now it is not my purpose in this paper to discuss the very delicate adjustment of method between teacher and pupil which Mr. Dewey here describes. The distinction which he draws between suggestion and imposition is tenuous and paradoxical. And yet the position seems to me essentially sound and inevitable. The teaching relationship is paradoxical. Any statement of it less perplexing than that which Mr. Dewey gives, is, I think, in so far less true. Pupils must be allowed to be themselves: they must, however, be helped and guided to become themselves. Within the limits of that dilemma all genuine teaching is, I am sure, forever confined. Whenever, on the one side or the other we break from that paradox we abandon values which are essential to the teaching process.

But the point toward which I am driving, though less obvious as a factor in Mr. Dewey's argument than the one which we pass by, is far more significant. It deals with content rather than method. It is the suggestion that the teacher is to have a course of study, that he is to work out organized bodies of knowledge, that he is to build up an organized subject matter, that he is to provide for the pupil such a scheme of studies as will make for the development of a coherent and integrated self. The teacher, I understand Mr. Dewey to say, is to have an intellectual program, a course of study, a curriculum. It makes no difference, for my present purpose, whether that curriculum is to be suggested or imposed. The essential point is that it is to exist, that it is to be in the mind of the teacher determining by its coherent outline all that he plans and does. Teachers must understand what they are doing — that is the demand which Mr. Dewey makes as he urges them on to furnish for the art of teaching a science or a philosophy of it adequate to its meaning.

We are then called upon, each one of us, to make a coherent plan of studies. How shall we go about it? Upon what basis shall we select and arrange our material so as to make of it an integrated and ordered whole? It is quite clear, as Mr. Dewey reminds us, that in each school and for each teacher this problem will take on different forms and colors. And yet it is equally clear that the similarities in our situations must far outweigh the differences. How then shall we approach this common problem and on what basis of mutual understanding shall we consider it together? Here is, I am sure, an essential and an urgent task for progressive teachers. As we go on to deal with it, I am sorry to say that we must part company with the argument of Mr. Dewey's paper. For at this point his argument stops. His purpose was only to show the need of coherence and order. He did not go further to discuss the next question: Along what lines and in what ways shall order and coherence be sought?

Now it is very far from my expectation to make an end of this question by answering it. It seems very clear to me that all that any one can hope to do just now is to try to make a beginning of dealing with it. And especially I have no thought of discussing at once all the different types of progressive schools. That, too, would be far beyond my powers and my information. But what I would like to do is to tell about this problem as I am finding it in my own work at Wisconsin. As some of my readers know, the University of Wisconsin has given to a small group of its teachers a free opportunity to create and fashion according to their hearts' desire the first two years of a liberal college. We are commissioned to do as we think best with respect to the course of study, the methods of teaching, and the determining conditions of undergraduate life. It is a very great opportunity and I need hardly say, a very terrifying one. In our arrangements with respect to determining conditions and methods of teaching, we are, I think, clearly and explicitly within the ranks of the progressive schools. We are determined that the pupil shall learn rather than be taught, that his work shall come from his own initiative rather than from fear or compulsion, that he shall have the sense of freedom in the arranging of his studying and his other experiences, that teachers and pupils shall associate in friendly and informal ways as persons who are together carrying on a common enterprise. I do not mean that we have fully established this quality of life in our community, but I do mean that this is what we are deliberately striving for. But there is the further problem of the course of study. What shall we all think about, what books shall we read, what fields shall we investigate, what facts shall we gather, what problems shall we discuss, what theories shall we suggest or attack or advocate? As one attempts to answer these questions it is hard to find one's footing. The progressive schools have told us much about the proper methods, the proper atmosphere for learning. But who will tell us what to learn? On what principles shall a course of study be organized? Toward what end shall it be directed? Decisions on these questions must be made every day, and the different decisions are consistent with or in conflict with each other. How shall we keep them consistent, and how shall we make them wise? Surely it is not worth while to learn unless there is some assurance that what we learn is worth learning.

Now I wish to urge this question upon progressive teachers because it seems to me that in the procedure of the progressive schools its answer is to be found. Those schools have, I think, the right method of teaching. But that seems to me to mean that, implicitly at least, they have the right content as well. It would be a strange situation if they should know very well how to do something but should be quite uncertain as to what it is they are doing. Method and content are not so externally related as that. If we know how to teach then in some form or other we know what we are teaching for. The good method is good only as it accomplishes some approved result. To know then that teaching is good is to know what it is good for, to know in terms of content the result at which it aims. Let us see how the method of progressive schools by necessary implication prescribes and dictates their course of study.

The two terms which seem most significant in the description of the progressive method of teaching are, first, the Growth of the Individual, and second, the Freedom of the Individual. For the sake of brevity I should like to take these two notions as characterizing the method as a whole. Our attempt will then be to discover in them implications as to the content of the course of study. The procedure is somewhat summary, but it will not, I think, for that reason at least, lead us astray.

The notion of Growth is for all of us primary. We think of the individual in terms of his tastes, his capacities, his powers. And we wish him to develop these, to be and to become himself in the fullest possible expression of them. Our method is therefore that of giving to the individual scope, opportunity, situation for the play of his own activities. Now what is there in this method which should determine the contents to be used, the end to be achieved? There is current among us a very abstract and empty interpretation of the notion of Growth from which no guidance whatever as to content can be gained. But I am certain that the notion is equally valueless as a principle of method. This view makes of the individual, with respect to his growth, something absolute and complete within himself. Each pupil is regarded as having some inner principle of life which, if only it is not interfered with by external circumstances, will lead that individual on into the development which is peculiar and appropriate to him. Now it is quite clear that according to this view there is no sense in trying to determine in advance in which direction a student should go. Each pupil goes as he goes, and there is nothing more to be said about the matter. There are no ends or aims to be talked about in advance, no contents to be selected or rejected. But it is equally true that there are no methods either. What shall a teacher do in the presence of such an inner principle? Sometimes we say that his part is to make conditions favorable for it. But what does "favorable" mean? Can it mean anything else than that according as conditions are adjusted the inner principle may take one direction or another and that the teacher, preferring one of these to the other, favors it and brings it into being? But to say that is to make the view deny and destroy itself. Surely the notion of Growth has a more intelligible meaning than this.

It is quite clear that the notion of growth as applied either to human individuals or to any other living things contains two factors which this abstract interpretation fails to see. First there are always external conditions on which growth or the lack of growth depends. No inner principle will keep a human being growing in wisdom or even in stature if air and food are not supplied him. And second, there are always two sets of possibilities open to a living thing: it may live, but it may also die; it may be built up, but it may also be broken down. And the determination of the event as between these two depends not only upon the inner principle of the thing itself, but also upon the external conditions and influences which play upon it. Now in any intelligible meaning of the word Growth as applied to the learning process, the teacher is an influence. His method rests upon a preference for one kind of development as against another. He sees his pupil not simply as the embodiment of an inner principle — though he does see him as that — but as an individual who is to live in the midst of an actual human situation. It is in relation to this situation that we may judge whether the pupil is developing or failing to develop, living or dying. And on this basis the teacher chooses that his pupil be this or that, and acts accordingly. His aim and his method are correlates each of the other. To know the one is to know something of the other.

And with respect to the notion of Freedom one finds in just the same way two widely different views. This notion too is often used very abstractly. Sometimes we speak as if we meant by freedom only the absence of outside interference. And from this point of view, acts of caprice and willfulness and folly are, if not interfered with, free in just the same sense as are self-control and reasonableness and generosity. But what is the value of freedom in this sense? Is it a good thing, if you are about to do evil, that no one should stop you; if you are ignorant, that no one should inform you; if you are wrong, that no one should correct you? Surely if one cannot help himself in the presence of disaster it is a calamity that no one else will do it for him. But when the progressive teacher keeps "hands off" in such a situation he is thinking of freedom in a far deeper and richer sense than this. He is thinking of the pupil as developing the power within his own nature to make his own decision wisely. And he is willing to let him make mistakes, willing to let him choose the wrong courses, because only by taking the responsibility of choice can the pupil build up that power of intelligence and self-direction which is freedom in any worth while sense of the term. I do not think that any progressive teacher would consider it good method to say to his pupils, "do as you like." What we do say is, "do as you think best." We know that human life reaches its highest levels only as a person becomes master of his own experience, whips his passions and caprices and weaknesses into subjection, sees his experience in terms of those things which are worth being and doing, and so makes of his living what he wills it to be. It is for the sake of their achieving that goal of positive freedom that we turn our students loose to make their own decisions, that we allow them to go their own ways instead of driving them by some form of force into subjection to our control.

Now if what I have said of these two methods is true, then it seems to me that, within the classroom at least, the progressive teacher has chosen his ends, and has thereby determined the content of his study. He wishes his pupils to become powerful and free individuals. He wishes them to be unhindered, unimpeded, joyous men and women. And he is contrasting these achievements, these successes, with the failures of meanness and limitation and obstruction and wretchedness. He believes in Growth and Freedom as the proper characters of a human individual. But now if this be the creed of the classroom, then it seems to me that from this creed as premise my argument may advance very rapidly to its desired conclusion. I am sure that you see already what I am trying to do. I am seeking on the basis of this method to commit the progressive teacher to a view of human living and of the world by which both his method and his choice of the content of study are determined. In his manner of dealing with his pupils I am trying to find his views of what pupils are and of what sort of a world it is in which they are living. And if again at this point you accuse me of dialectics then I must protest that I am using with respect to the content of study exactly the same argument which Mr. Dewey has used with telling effect in dealing with the methods of teaching. For you will recall that Mr. Dewey protests most vigorously against the isolation of the school from the outside world. He condemns the artificiality of the traditional relationship between teacher and pupil as wholly foreign to normal human relations and as cutting the school off in quite disastrous ways from living contact with men and things as they are. But if such an isolation with respect to method is disastrous, the same sundering with respect to content cannot be less harmful. If a teacher is, within the classroom, practicing beliefs which have for him no validity outside the classroom there cannot be much vitality or force in his instruction. If subjects of study are chosen which have no essential significance for the living and working and enjoying and suffering of the everyday men and women whom the pupil knows, why should we expect him to find them interesting or important? It is bad enough that learning and life should be sundered from each other by artificiality of manner. But if they are separated by sheer irrelevance of content, if there is between them no connection of genuine significance, then teaching must perforce be a thing of no account, and learning a wasting of time in a world where time is too valuable to be wasted.

Here then is our argument in a word. We are seeking for some way of bringing our decisions concerning the course of study into order and coherence. And in order to do that we need some relatively common and permanent basis of judgment to which our various decisions may be referred. Where shall we find such a basis? My suggestion is that it is already present, at least by implication, in the method of teaching which we have adopted. That method of teaching rests upon a view of human life and the human situation which at once determines, just so far as it can be made definite, both what materials we shall use for teaching and the ways in which that material shall be managed in the classroom.

The progressive teacher wishes his pupils to become powerful and self-directing. To use one of our most telling phrases, he has respect for them as human individuals; so far as they are concerned he is an advocate, a believer in Human Growth and Human Freedom. But if there be an organic connection between the classroom and the outside world, then from the acceptance of this belief other consequences follow. If I believe that the young people under my care should develop and be free then I must believe that other young people in other classrooms should also develop and become free. If I believe the first then I must believe the second, unless there can be found differentiating circumstances which justify a difference of attitude in the two cases. And if young people in classrooms should grow up and enjoy the life of eager and active self-expression, what of young people outside the classrooms? Would not the same type of life be good for them? Is there any essential difference between the people with whom I have personal acquaintance, those for whom I have immediate personal affection, and the other larger group who are not in the same way known to me? If a certain way of life is essentially and fundamentally good for the young as we prepare them for maturity is it to be supposed that that way of life has no value or worth for the same persons when they have become mature and have left the school behind them? In a word, I am asking, Can I believe in growth and freedom for those whom I teach and at the same time be indifferent or hostile to Growth and Freedom as qualities of life in the wider reaches of human society? If I do thus contradict myself then it seems to me that I make of my teaching a petty, capricious, provincial thing. And at the same time I show all too clearly that the Growth and Freedom which I desire for my students are far removed from the achievements of my own spirit. Out of such littleness and meanness of view there can come only littleness and meanness of teaching. One cannot teach Growth and Freedom unless one believes in them, believes in them utterly, not as tricks of the classroom but as the qualities of human living toward whose creation and establishment every human purpose must be directed, by whose successes or failures every human action, every human institution, must be approved or condemned.

Now if this last step is safely taken we have, I think, the principle in terms of which a liberal college may order its content, may select and arrange its subjects, may intellectualize its curriculum. A liberal college exists whenever young people, varying in age usually from 18 to 22, come to a group of teachers, asking that they be taught how to share in the activities of human thinking. And the question of the course of study is, What shall we think about? What are the proper interests of the free and unbiased mind? Amid all the multiplicity and variety of mental achievement, what lines shall we select as constituting a liberal course of study? What does the liberal mind think about?

And to this question, the answer of the progressive teacher must be, I think, clear and unequivocal. The one thing of importance in the world, his method tells him, is that human individuals should grow and be free. Every human situation admits of two kinds of using. It may be so managed that the human beings involved in it shall be thwarted in their development, hindered in their activities, lowered in their virtue, degraded in their quality. Or it may be used to accomplish human ends, to make the lives of men and women richer and more worthwhile, to create human values, to achieve the growth and freedom of the human spirit. What then shall we study? What shall we think about? There is, in the last resort, only one question for men and women who wish to understand life, one question in relation to which all other questions take their proper subsidiary places and from which they derive whatever significance they may have. That question is, How can the quality of human life be exalted — not here or there, not merely in this favored place or in that center of my affections, but wherever human beings are alive, wherever men may achieve or fail to achieve the qualities of growth and freedom.

But it will be asked how so general a principle as this can be used in organizing a course of study. And my reply must be that as yet I can answer that question only in outline. I do know, however, that on the basis of such a principle as this, one can see the glaring defects and inconsistencies and failures of our present schemes of study. We can see how irrelevant they are, how lacking in essential human drive and impulse. But what — if we have the chance to do as we think best — what shall we put in the place of these? Let me at least try to indicate the lines along which an answer to this positive question may be sought.

I have said that the essential task of the human mind is to study the human situation in order to determine how it can best be used for the furtherance of the human values which we sum up under the term, the growth and freedom of the individual. But this situation, when we examine it, is easily resolvable into three sets of factors whose several conditions and activities bear upon and determine the quality of men's experiences. Those three factors are, first, the individual himself; second, the network of relationships surrounding him, which is human society; and third, the non-human things which impinge upon the individual and his fellows, and which, taken together, we call Nature, or the world, or the universe — that something in the midst of which and by means of which the human drama comes into being, is carried on, and passes away. Now if this be a valid classification, then we have ready at hand a three-fold division of the course of study. We must try to know the Self and Society and the World. We must try to know each of these as it bears upon the quality of human experience, as it may therefore be used for the creating of that something valuable on which our hearts are set.

If now, with our essential question in mind, the reader will go with me in turn into these three fields of human interest, we may, I think, begin to see the outlines of a coherent course of study. And first we must ask, What is there in the self which contributes to its own development and freedom; what is there, on the other hand, which hinders and thwarts its own proper functioning? Every incident in the life of an individual we must see as an opportunity, as a chance to win or to lose in relation to a desired end. And hence we must study and know the human being, first as his tastes and tendencies and activities contribute to his well-being, and second, as they break him down, block his progress, make his life of little or no account. We must study him as an influence upon himself, furthering or preventing his own achievement.

And second, in the same way, we must study the institutions and forces of human society. For example, as men set up procedures for the creation of wealth, for the satisfying of external needs, they make what we call the economic order. That order our minds must investigate in all its intricacies and must judge in all its effects. In the customary workings of that order we find human beings falling apart into two groups, the rich and the poor, those who have much and those who have little. We must then ask whether such riches and such poverty are good in their effects upon human growth and freedom. And if men say to us that only by setting loose and uncontrolled the economic forces which raise some men up and thrust others down can we accomplish that lavish supplying of material goods which the modern industrial world has achieved, then must we ask: Might we not, in terms of real values, be better off if we created less? In a word, we must regard our economic order as only one possible way of accomplishing our purposes. We must therefore forever hold it open to judgment as against other possible forms of procedure or other modifications of itself by which the same ends might be achieved. So too in the field of politics. Men must have established institutions. Unless they can agree upon concerted forms of common action their life is inevitably futile and degraded and self-destructive. But in the political order which we have worked out we find features which do not seem to serve human well-being. Men fall apart into the rulers and the ruled, the masters and the subjects. We find classes fighting against classes, nations arming to destroy nations. Are these the best arrangements that the mind of man can contrive for the lifting of his life into power and freedom? — And likewise with our other social institutions. No relationships go deeper in their influence upon the quality of human experience than those which have to do with the relations of the sexes and with the birth of children. How intelligent are our present dealings with those relationships? Sometimes it seems as if our ruling motive in dealing with this area of experience were a timorous shrinking from change, our most powerful argument blind social disapprobation and the taboo. And sometimes, too, it must be said, this attitude is evenly matched by a dreadful social irresponsibility, a mere following of impulse without regard to deeper values or meanings. But however that may be, I am sure that one permanent element in all liberal study must be the critical inquiry into our social institutions to see how well they are contributing to the growth and freedom of the human spirit.

And, third, if we take with us into the world of Nature the same critical inquiry, the studies which we call science and philosophy will assume their proper places as elements in a coherent plan. First we wish to know what the world about us is, so that we may tell how to use it for human purposes. And second, we wish to know what things are, in order that we may adjust ourselves to them in terms of attitude and appreciation. In the first case our science finds its proper justification in a technology by which material results can be achieved. In the second case, the human being attempts to so interpret his universe that he may take his proper place in a scheme of things to which he belongs, by which he is created. To put it somewhat crudely, the two questions are, first: What use can I make of the world, and second: What use, if any, can the world make of me?

But now I am sure that I have said enough to indicate the lines along which it seems to me progressive teachers are bound to build up a coherent scheme of studies. My sketch is, of course, very crude and incomplete, but it may serve to suggest a way in which our most important problem can be dealt with. The essential point may be expressed by saying that our approach to knowledge, our use of knowledge in teaching, must be humanistic, must be dominated by an interest in human beings, by devotion to their development in power and freedom. And with that summation I must leave my thesis.

There are, however, two notes of explanation which I should like to append to the argument before closing this paper. I will try to make them very brief.

In the first place, I have not intended to say that the progressive teacher must be a social revolutionary. Nothing is further from my thought than the suggestion that we are, by our program, committed to any particular point of view with regard to the controversial moral issues of our time. All I have meant to say is that in order to teach we must be facing those issues, must be grappling with them with all our might. In them and in the necessity of dealing with them is to be found all the real justification of our teaching. And, as I have said before, unless our teaching is dominated by them, unless it springs out of a vital interest in the fundamental issues of human life, it must be a pithless and superficial thing. One cannot teach young people to love wisdom unless one is himself an ardent lover of wisdom. One cannot lead young people to grapple with problems unless he is himself grappling with them. Here, may I remark, is the strength of the leadership of Mr. Dewey. He has taught this country how to teach because he is a fine and powerful spirit masterfully working for human growth and freedom. Without such an attitude one may equip one's classroom with clever tricks, but one cannot make it a place of insight and learning. With such an attitude our minds are open to the arguments of every sect, of every part, of every interest. Our only enemy is the man, be he radical or conservative, who would stifle inquiry, who would set limits to the activity of the mind as it battles its way toward the truth.

And, finally, as I have outlined a coherent course of study which might be, in a proper sense, required for all pupils in a college, I have not meant to introduce compulsion or fear or external pressure into the method of teaching. What seems to me essential is that the teacher should know what he is teaching for, should have a clear and lucid understanding of the end which he is trying to achieve. And if, as I have suggested, the dominating motive in that end is the freeing of the human spirit it may well be that he can best teach freedom by practicing it in his relations with his pupils. In fact I doubt if freedom can be taught effectively in any other way. But however we teach it, of this one thing I am certain,— our teaching is justified only as its drives straight and true toward human growth and freedom.

15

Hamilton Holt

CREATIVE EDUCATION

15

CREATIVE EDUCATION

Hamilton Holt

PRESIDENT OF ROLLINS COLLEGE, FLORIDA
[FORMERLY EDITOR OF "THE INDEPENDENT"]

THERE are two ways to get results in this world: by force and by reason. In international affairs, these methods are represented by war and arbitration. It is foolish to say that it is impossible to get results by war — force does bring results, but to win a war is infinitely more costly than to lose an arbitration.

Carrying the parallel of international relations into the realm of education, it seems to me that for generations we have been trying to educate our students by the methods of war rather than by those of peace. The theory animating this system is that the younger generation is wrong — that it is a culprit on trial for misdemeanor or even for crime. The entire system of marks, grades, quizzes, final examinations — the lock-step with its marking and grading systems, with its final "criminal trial" in the form of an examination which the student must pass in order to be allowed to continue his work — puts him in the light of a prisoner, or a soldier in the ranks of a system of militarism which is Prussian in the rigidity of its codes.

How can there be any sense of mutual understanding or equality between prisoner and jailor; between officer and private? The point of view of the younger generation is entirely disregarded — in fact, it isn't even admitted that it has a point of view. There is no sense that the quest for knowledge should be a joyous adventure, undertaken jointly, the older men, rich in experience, knowing the lay of the land which must be traveled, acting as guides for the younger people whose senses must be trained, whose minds must be developed and whose imaginations must be stimulated in order to learn to travel the way alone.

At Rollins College we are trying to get away from this system which seems to me stultifying to the teacher and subversive to the development of the creative faculties of the student. We do not pretend that we have established a new system of education at Rollins; merely that what we are doing is an attempt at liberation from the old system. Just where our efforts will lead us eventually, we are not sure. We are feeling our way. Perhaps in ten years we will look back upon our present methods as crude and uncertain. But we do know that the change from the stereotyped manner of absorbing and giving out information has unleashed a tremendous enthusiasm and zest for learning and for living among both students and faculty which is in itself a goal worth attaining if we go no farther. The point is that we are trying the same thing in education that the governments are trying in settling international disputes — that is, persuasion, mutual understanding, conference, arbitration, rather than ultimatums and warfare.

In addition to this point of view as to the proper relationship of teacher and pupil and the way in which it is mutually advantageous for them to work together, I am a believer in Herbert Spencer's main categories of the things we must learn in order to maintain and to enjoy life, and it seems to me that no system of education can be fundamental unless it follows the order in which Spencer names them.

The reader will remember that the first lesson in this primer of living is to learn to keep alive — that is, we must learn the dangers of fire in order not to burn ourselves, and of water, in order not to drown: elementary facts which we learn while we are still so young that we are scarcely aware of the process through which we are going.

Second, we must learn to provide the prime requisites of life for the individual — these are food, shelter and clothing. This brings us into the realm of business, in the large sense of that word. It means learning the fundamental laws by which raw materials are converted into finished products; the laws of supply and demand; the regulating of trade,— in fact, a sort of glorified sociology and economics, a philosophy of business. It does not mean taking courses in bookkeeping or stenography or any one of the multifarious subjects which are taught as a preparation for a so-called business career.

The third item in Spencer's list of lessons is that we must learn to provide for the next generation, or in other words, that we must study the laws governing eugenics, sex, marriage, the education of children, and, of course, the education of parents.

In the fourth place, we must learn the laws of group consciousness, and this brings us into the realm of sociology, politics and government.

Finally, we must learn to minister to the happiness of the individual — and this brings us into the domain of culture, of music, of travel and literature, in fact, into that realm upon which our present system of education has focused the main emphasis of its effort. We have reversed the order of Spencer's categories of things we must learn in order to know how to live. The present system of higher education has for its chief objective a cultural training. To a lesser extent, it emphasizes the necessity for knowing the laws of group consciousness by its courses in political and social and governmental fields. It is beginning to take into account the necessity of learning to provide for the next generation by teaching something about eugenics and sex. But the present system of education virtually overlooks the necessity of preparing the individual to provide for himself by teaching him the fundamental laws which govern the world of business, interpreting that world as a knowledge of the means of providing for the life of the individual.

Until we follow Herbert Spencer's category in the order of its listing, not in reverse order, I do not believe we will have a system which has a basis of integrity upon which we can really build.

Then I also believe that religion or one's philosophy of life should play a large part in education. If you think, with Balfour, that "life is a disreputable incident on a minor planet," naturally your whole attitude toward what is worth while and what isn't, is vastly different from what it is if you believe in a higher guiding power for a universe that is fundamentally law-abiding.

But next to religion students get most from the personality of people they love and admire and wish to emulate. Consequently, there are no agnostics or atheists on the faculty of Rollins College. And while it is a non-denominational college, two years of Bible study are required, so that no student may graduate without a knowledge of the world's greatest example of religious literature.

For if you limit the educational process to sharpening the mind, without at the same time developing the will power to keep it sharpened, and the moral sense to use it for a worthwhile project, you may be educating a menace to society, rather than an ally. Education is a process of development from within. Teachers may provide the student's mental tools, but only he can decide how well he may use them.

But young people must be given the advantage, in the process of their education, of contact with the kind of personalities which are in themselves open doors to better understanding of life and of their fellow men. Irving Bacheller lives in Winter Park and is one of our trustees. And since novelists deal with people and are supposed to know more about the human heart than the rest of us, I felt that he had much to give the students which could only be given personally, not gleaned from his delightful books. So I asked Mr. Bacheller if he would invite a group of the more mature students to his home some evening.

"What shall I do with them?" he asked.

"I don't care in the least what you do with them," I replied, "if you just let them come and know you."

But afterwards I grew curious and asked Mr. Bacheller how they had spent the evening.

"I read them the greatest short story ever written and we discussed it," he answered. "The story of the Prodigal Son."

And so I believe education should proceed.

When I became president of Rollins College four years ago I knew very definitely what I did not want in the way of educational methods, for I had suffered under the lecture system and the recitation system for too many years not to know how seriously they may handicap any real flowering student's mind; how eagerness may be replaced by indifference, and finally by boredom.

For example, I spent seven years studying Latin, under the day by day system of assignment and translation. Greek also. I hadn't the vaguest notion of what I was supposed to get from these studies in the end — whether beauty of literature, or greatness of moral concept, or knowledge of antiquity. No one ever told me. I didn't even learn syntax, which I did know that I was supposed to learn. But its dullness was insupportable. Now, after those seven years, I can't translate the Latin dedications on public buildings, or read the Greek word interpolated by the author in a crucial point of his text. They are wasted years so far as Latin and Greek are concerned.

But I happen to have in my possession a Latin and Greek library which represents the accumulation of several generations of scholars, and I had leisure last Summer, for the first time in my life, to spend time delving into its contents. I read the plays of Euripides, the Odes of Horace, Ovid's Metamorphosis and his Love Letters, Juvenile's Satires, Plato's Dialogues, and some of the Orations of Cicero — all, of course, in translation. I found them human, fascinating, charming, and modern. They dealt with life and the essence of life. I was filled with mingled rage and delight — delight at discovering these literary treasures; rage that I had not been helped to discover them thirty years ago.

When I left college and entered my professional career as a magazine editor, I was profoundly impressed to find that my colleagues in the editorial room, who never thought of teaching me anything, taught me everything; while my professors at the university, who were paid to teach me, had taught me almost nothing. Yet my fellow workers in journalism and my professors in college were the same type of men — that is, the members of each group were older, abler, and nobler than myself; they were specialists in their own fields, as I was not; they were leading the intellectual life on a high moral plane. As I pondered over this paradox, the explanation seemed perfectly clear to me. With my business associates, I worked elbow to elbow, desk to desk, eight hours a day, six days a week. I was as active in my work as they. Our relationship was constant, continuous, coöperative, democratic, friendly and human. With my instructors at the university, however, I had no relationship except in the most formal and forbidding way. When I was with them under both the recitation system at Yale and the lecture system at Columbia, they were active and I was passive. Did any one ever get an education by being a sponge?

There are in my opinion, two necessary factors in successful education: students who will to learn and teachers who wish to teach. In spite of the fact that both of these limiting phrases are supposed to be taken for granted in defining either group, they frequently do not apply in the least. Teachers, many of them, want to write or do research, or both, and look upon the teaching side of their work as necessary evil. And certainly no one will deny that the term "student" has no real application for a goodly proportion of the young people who attend colleges and universities.

To bring these two necessary factors together under circumstances most favorable to the intellectual and imaginative stimulus of both has been our problem at Rollins. Wherever the traditional form of imparting information or of gaining it has seemed to fail, we have thrown it overboard, and established in its place an approach which has all the impetus of the standards of interest which prevail in the outside world of affairs. Within the limits of possibility, Rollins College has patterned its mode of life upon normal living, rather than upon the artificialities of the usual college or university existence.

It seemed to me that a college education should be a joint adventure, a thrilling adventure in which the accumulated knowledge and wisdom of all the ages forms a sort of hunting preserve where, under the guidance of seasoned sports-men, the amateur may track down and bag his own game. What, conceivably, could have more zest for the adventurous, for the alive, for the curious, than to learn something about this game of living from men and women who have made the history and the literature of the world? What an enormous advantage it should be to the young, alert, eager mind to spend four years in salvaging from the past the treasures of its records.

And just how much of an adventure does it prove to the average student who sits passively under the drone of the college lecturer or who learns a prescribed lesson which he, in common with the rest of the class, spends an hour in regurgitating piece-meal to the teacher, who is the inquisitor? It becomes a dull routine which only the exceptional student, by his own short-cuts and his own delving, can rise above. No wonder the cry is everywhere rising that the product of our system of higher education is a stereotyped, standardized one, in which the flame of individual initiative and invention has often burned out.

The forces which, it seems to me, make for this failure of education in American institutions are three: first, the insatiable impulse to expand materially; second, the glorification of research at the expense of teaching; and third, the lack of human contact between teacher and student.

There are, of course, certain advantages in mere numbers. Obviously, the larger the student body, the more diversified and the more comprehensive can be the curriculum and the more varied the student activities within and without the class-room. On the other hand, as the enrollment multiplies, the ratio of the individual student to the whole tends to approximate a cipher. Only the mature or exceptional student achieves academic, social or athletic honors. The average student often loses his courage under the keenness of the competition. Not infrequently he acquires an inferiority complex which not only blights his college life but from which it may take him years to recover.

Whatever advantages mere size of student enrollment and impressive cubic feet of buildings may have, we felt at Rollins that the disadvantages to the individual student far outweighed them, and so we limited our student body to 700. At the present time, we have only about 350 students because that is the maximum number our resources permit us to care for, but those 350 are gathered in from 35 states and 10 foreign countries . . . a fact, which in itself gives breadth of view and a certain cosmopolitan stature to our student group.

Happily, the realization seems to be growing that rate of expansion is not necessarily a measure of success and a few institutions are beginning to limit enrollment. But even though the menace of wholesale growth is coming to be appreciated, another menace — the mania for research — continues to thrive and to receive encouragement.

I am willing to venture the opinion that any one of us who looks back over his college days with any glow of appreciation for what they meant to him in an academic way, does so because of two or three figures, which stand out against a colorless background like huge shadows thrown against a blank wall. Perhaps only one figure stands out as a revelation of what a real teacher may be. Strangely enough, these teacher-professors — the men who are primarily interested in teaching students rather than subjects, are usually not the ones who win promotions or calls from other colleges. Yet it is these rare souls who make the real impressions on the students. Wherever they are to be found, the students with unerring instinct elect their courses, preferring them to the most world-renowned researcher on the faculty.

Rollins College faculty was, then, the first great problem to be solved. We sought inspiring teachers wherever we could find them, disregarding the modern fetish for research and weighing not only the ordinary and official recommendations as to a man's teaching ability, but giving especial heed to the opinion of his former students. No matter how scholarly a man might be, or how many books he might have to his credit, he was not considered unless he proved to have the rare gift for guiding and encouraging others which is of the essence of good teaching.

Moreover, since it seemed impossible to suppose that one man could handle a class of forty or fifty students in a manner to give inspiration to them all, we have made sure of close contact between students and faculty, by limiting classes to groups of twenty. For our 350 students at Rollins, there are some 40 teachers.

We have tried to solve the problem of bringing the teacher and taught together by abolishing both the recitation and the lecture systems, and establishing in their places the so-called "Two-Hour Conference Plan." This proposal has for its purpose, and hopes to effect, continuous consultation and co-operation between teacher and student. The theory behind this innovation is that the student's mind is immature, that frequently he does not know how to study, and that he most needs the professor when he is preparing his lesson and not after he has learned or failed to learn it.

To visit Rollins classrooms is to have a new experience in college methods of instruction. The students sit in comfortable chairs scattered around a book-lined room, or they gather about a table. The room may be silent, with every one quietly reading or writing, or there may be a buzz of conversation as various groups discuss some aspect of the subject they are studying. The teacher sits at his desk, neither lecturing nor hearing a recitation. His primary function is to sit still, keep quiet, and be ready to help any one who needs help,— to answer rather than to ask questions. He does not do the work for the students but guides and stimulates them. He may even refuse to answer questions if he feels it will be more helpful for them to work out the answers for themselves. Of course, parts of some periods are given over to talks by the teacher, assignment of work, group questioning — even old-fashioned quizzes. But for the most part the teacher's work is with individual students, each of whom may be at a different stage of advancement in the course. When there is something to say, they talk. When there is nothing to say, all work, as in a well-managed business office.

At present the Rollins Conference Plan provides for class periods of two hours' duration but its essential feature is its flexibility. In some classes all students may be required to spend the entire two hours in the classroom with the exception of a few minutes' respite. In others, part of them go to the library or elsewhere to do some of their studying. In yet others the professor may not keep the group together for the entire two hours. Often the students are so interested in the subject under discussion that they voluntarily remain longer than the allotted time. Typical of the plan's flexibility is an English class in which the professor, seeing some of the pupils farther advanced than others, permitted that little group to spend the regular class period in writing whatever they wanted, meeting together at his home on Sunday evenings to read the product of this free time.

As part of the Conference Plan, regular term and yearly examinations have been minimized and even tests and quizzes are not stressed. Moreover, it is intended that since all necessary studying may be done in the classroom, virtually all the student's outside time shall be free. Thus the Oxford and Cambridge ideal of the allowance of much leisure time is at least partially carried out; there is time to think, to engage in semiserious intellectual discussion, to digest the lessons of the day, or if the student desires, to do advanced work, or even to complete his course in less than the conventional four years.

Another characteristic of study at Rollins is the fact that students are given every opportunity to get at the sources of information themselves. Nothing is taken second-hand which may be acquired first-hand. No opportunity is lost to replace textbooks with life: a biology class journeys to Tarpon Springs to study the sponge industry, where "a barefoot Greek driver on a picturesque ocean sailboat" was for the moment the instructor of the class; students interested in journalism attend the State Press Conference; the surveying class goes to Tampa to study cement making; the International Relations Club gathers at the President's house to meet informally with a recent Prime Minister of Italy and an officer of the French Academy; the entomology group does the same to meet a great neurologist, whose hobby happens to be beetles; the sociology class spends a week-end digging in ancient Indian mounds; a physics class drives to Daytona Beach to study high-powered automobiles, comparing structure, motor power, wind resistance and cooling systems of the cars of two world champion drivers; a class in the History of the Book follows the actual production of a book from the original manuscript to a beautiful finished volume issued by the professor's private press; a history class makes a trip to St. Augustine to meet with the Florida Historical Society and study the oldest city in the United States and to discover the part it played in our early colonization.

Throughout the daily chronicle of college life, there runs this thread of vigorous activity, of awareness of what is going on in the world, of eagerness to relate the studies of the classroom to outside practical affairs. The whole emphasis at Rollins, whether in the curriculum, teaching method or community life, is upon the full and free development of the individual, and the student early comes to feel that the College wants to put itself at his disposal rather than put him through a course of intellectual sprouts. Rollins trusts its students, assumes that they are there to get an education and that they do not need to be driven.

This confidence extends to the conduct of student affairs, and even to matters of discipline. A Board of Appeal containing four students and three faculty members can be resorted to by any student who feels that he has been unfairly treated by the administration. But in the three years of its existence it has been asked to function only once.

The realization that students and teachers are engaged in a common task helps to make Rollins a business-like college. When the bugle sounds the assembly call with its implication of military precision as a signal for a new class period to begin, the students are expected to meet their appointments just as promptly as if they worked in an office. If they have good reason for absence it is granted easily enough but no unexplained "cuts" are permitted. No football coach would consider granting ten cuts to a candidate for the team. Football is taken too seriously for that. By taking our academic work as seriously we hope to achieve results as fruitful as those of the coach.

As for the students themselves, under the two-hour conference plan and the opportunities they are given to get at the sources of information themselves, they develop, most of them, a zest for learning which is akin to the journalist's enthusiasm for tracking down a good story. Rollins has shifted its emphasis and its focus of responsibility from faculty and administration to students. And because young people really accept responsibility very well and because they like being treated as adult, responsible human beings, they soon lose, if they have it on entrance, the average college student's resistance to things academic. They change their philosophy of learning to meet the change in our philosophy of teaching. They learn to recognize education for what we believe it should be: a joint adventure and a joint quest.

Rollins College makes no claim to revolutionary departures from the established order in the educational field, rather it has simply harked back to a much earlier period for its inspiration, as when Socrates gathered a few pupils around him and made the objective of his inquiry into this or that subject "consistent thinking with a view to consistent action." Somewhere in the effort to build up the most elaborate machinery in the world for turning out academic degrees it seems to me that we have lost the essence of true education and that to find it again we must revert to simpler methods, fewer rules, less emphasis upon information for its own sake and more upon linking the subject studied with the life of the individual studying it. We must somehow inspire our students with the *desire* to know, and in order to do that we must have them work shoulder to shoulder with leaders whom they can love and admire. At Rollins this simple expedient has proved fruitful even beyond our hopes.

If I have talked more of the things we are doing at Rollins than I should in this chapter on education it is because my interests have been so completely absorbed by our experiments in departing from the stereotyped system upon which I was brought up, that I have had little opportunity to formulate ideas on general tendencies or to watch what other institutions similarly determined to liberate themselves from outgrown methods have evolved.

It is obvious, I think, to the most casual observer of the educational field, that reforms must come. There is too much dissatisfaction among college students; too little recognizable gain in getting on with the business of living from the four years of undergraduate work as it is at present carried on in most of our colleges and universities. Brilliant students are held back. The whole emphasis is upon mediocrity. It takes too long under the present system to recognize the drones and the students who aren't mentally capable of profiting by a college education and to get rid of them.

But I believe firmly that when the time is ripe for anything to be born it is born. That is the great hope of education. Reforms must come just as reforms in the handling of international affairs are coming. But we cannot accomplish anything by envisioning and trying to put into effect a system which is too far ahead of the conceptions and ideals of the majority of people.

My own faith in the desirability of developing and perfecting the small college has been greatly strengthened by our adventure at Rollins. Intimate contact between teacher and student when the former not only knows how to teach but loves to teach, and the latter is there for the purpose of learning is, I believe, the answer to innumerable problems of educational value. That is why I feel that I can justify myself in going into as much detail as I have on the simple methods we have evolved and found satisfactory at Rollins.

16

Abbott Lawrence Lowell

SELF-EDUCATION IN HARVARD COLLEGE

16

SELF-EDUCATION IN HARVARD COLLEGE[1]

Abbott Lawrence Lowell

PRESIDENT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

OF late years there has been much criticism of the American college on the ground that undergraduates do not take their education seriously; that, with them, it is secondary to social and athletic interests — things in themselves good, but which should not overshadow the main object for which the colleges exist. This criticism has had too much foundation; and, if the desire of undergraduates for a sound education cannot be increased over what it has been, the American college, in spite of its present vogue, will not endure. Some universities have indeed proposed to give up the freshman and sophomore years, leaving them to junior colleges — in other words, to continuation secondary schools — devoting the university to such studies as professional law and medicine, and to the graduate school, which is essentially a preparation for teaching and research in an academic career.

Such a proposal is, virtually, to give up the American college as part of the university. No one should object to it, least of all those of us who believe in experiments in education. For many, perhaps for most, young Americans professional training had better begin at the close of secondary instruction; but for those who expect to go far, to work in a large way, to live on a higher intellectual plane, this is not enough; nor is it in their case only a selfish ambition. For the country it is extremely important that as many of its citizens as possible be highly educated, possess the largeness of view that comes from familiarity with what men have done and thought, and what men are doing and thinking, what our complex civilization has become and how it came to pass.

---

[1] This article by President Lowell, of Harvard University, was given as an address at the Convocation of the University of the State of New York, October 18, 1929, and is used by permission of the President of the University of the State of New York.

Much of this has no direct application to earning one's daily bread. It belongs to the region of imponderables, which, however, largely determine what a man is and what a nation will be. For want of a better name we will call it culture, or liberal education; but its very intangible quality renders it hard to explain to the young man with no specialized intellectual ambition. Like an orchid in a green-house, it grows only in a congenial climate, that is, in an atmosphere adapted for its development. For this the American college exists, and some of us have supposed that its temperature may be raised and made more propitious. With that object we have at Harvard been trying various experiments, not believing that we have found the only means to the end, but hoping they point to one method of drawing nearer to the goal.

Professional students have, as a rule, much more respect for high standing in their various schools than undergraduates have for rank in college. No doubt, the latter varies in different colleges, but in general the statement is certainly true, especially where college and professional studies are sharply separated. This difference in attitude between professional and academic students is largely due to the fact that young men think they see, and to some extent do see, a connection between excellence in the professional school and success in their future career, and do not see a connection between thorough training of the mind in college and success in life.

Another reason may be found in the attitude of college professors themselves, who tend to be more interested in students proposing to make the subject taught their occupation in life than in those using it to develop their minds for other lines of work. This is much less true in England, where there is no more interest in the candidate, say for *litteræ humaniores*, who is looking forward to a classical academic career, than to another whose ambition is the bar, the bench, or public life.

A third cause is the general American attitude, which delights to point out how small was Lincoln's schooling, how little scholarship is worth, and how in later life the sport passes the grind. With the growing complexity and competition in American business life, with statistical studies, like that of Mr. Walter Gifford on the "Relation of Rank in College and Salaries in the American Bell Telephone Company," this attitude is tending to fade. It is indeed common to assign as a fourth reason for the lack of respect for excellence in college, the social prominence of athletes; but one may doubt whether this is as important as it seems. The front pages of our newspapers are filled with descriptions of sporting events of all sorts and the victorious are popular heroes, but this has no effect in deterring men from more serious pursuits.

To lay the foundation for what I have to say, I must assume three propositions: First, that all true education in college is self-education; and, therefore, the student must be induced to desire to make an effort, and a strenuous effort. Second, interest comes from doing, rather than doing from interest; and therefore, if men can be induced to make the effort, the desire will be created or strengthened. Third, that, with some notable exceptions, men in the main act less from individual impulse than from mass impulse, that is, they do what others do, or what others respect and admire. Therefore we should seek to create a favorable environment; and one of the elements of this is competition, and a competition in something that men feel to be a real test of qualities worth having. Hence it is an advantage to have every one compete in something which is regarded by them as a test of real ability. These three principles are mutually supplementary, and I shall try to illustrate, not to demonstrate, them; for that there is not space enough in a paper of this length!

The blight of American education is working for near objectives and scoring them off when attained, a tendency encouraged by the system of courses and counting of credits. The aim or goal should be as remote as possible, consistent with its being not so far off that thought of it can be postponed for the present. With that idea we require for graduation a general examination on a relatively wide field.

This is done in a number of colleges for a small part of the students under the name of honor courses — a term that needs some explanation because its various meanings are commonly confused. The words "honor students" or "honor courses" are used to signify either the completion of college work with distinguished excellence, or some unusual method of doing it, such as freedom of attendance at lectures, permitting men to study by themselves with the aid of a tutor, and often requiring a special examination. When a college states that a certain percentage of its students are taking honor courses, this does not mean that they are all doing distinguished work therein. The term comes from the Honor Schools at Oxford and the Triposes in Cambridge where there are honor and pass degrees with different curricula, but the honor degree does not necessarily signify distinguished accomplishment. At Oxford, indeed, the fourth grade of honors means no higher grade of work than a pass. It denotes a different curriculum, and the statement that Balliol College, for example, will receive only men who go in for honors means that all its undergraduates are pursuing the honor courses — not that they are all doing so with excellence. Now, as in Balliol, every undergraduate at Harvard must take an honor course, except those concentrating in chemistry, a department which has not yet adopted the plan, but this does not mean that they all do it with distinction. Only to those who do so do we give honors. These may be said to correspond to the first, second, and part of the third classes of honors at Oxford, not to the rest of the third, or the fourth, or the pass degree. It may be noted that the proportion of students at Oxford taking an honor curriculum has in the last twenty-five years increased from about 25 per cent to 75 per cent of the students, and there has been some talk of abolishing the pass degree altogether.

The honor course at Harvard involves for graduation a general examination on a fairly wide field of the student's choice, which covers ground not included in any courses he has taken, or even in any given by the Department. Every year about 7 per cent of the men whose records in courses have been satisfactory fail to pass this examination. To guide and aid him toward this test as well as to train him to educate himself, the student has the benefit of a tutor after his freshman year. Now, as already pointed out, substantially all our men are required to take the honor course. That is done on the principle, already stated, that a competition is more respected where every one takes part, if, as in the case of the general examination, it is regarded by the students themselves, as a measure of ability to use and coördinate knowledge; whereas marks in courses are, or are believed by students to be, much more tests of diligence and memory than of real capacity.

In setting up such a university honor course, with the general examination as its goal, we do not propose to give up the usual American system of courses of instruction followed by examinations and graded marks. These can and do greatly stimulate the student, and they bring him into contact with a number of teachers, while no pure tutorial system can bring him into close contact with more than a small number, usually one or two; and each contact means the possibility of additional stimulus. Courses and tutors are, we believe, better than either alone, provided there is a general examination on a large subject as the final goal.

Another factor at Harvard has been the tutor, and again one must explain that this is not an office but a function. The tutor may and does have every grade in the academic scale, from instructor to full professor, and many men are giving some courses and doing some tutoring — a most desirable thing. The tutor comes into a closer personal contact with his pupil than the teacher of a course can fully attain, and hence he induces the pupil to read for himself, to discuss what he has read, to form opinions of his own, to take an interest in the subject for himself, to master it, with a view to a distant goal, not to an examination at the end of the half-year or year after which the subject may be dismissed. If the man has good native ability, the tutor urges him to try for distinction, and with that object to write a thesis on his own research. But the tutor would be of comparatively small use, and it has been so proved, without a final general examination on a relatively wide field. Football would be an insipid affair without goal posts or touchdowns. That the tutor stimulates interest, that the conference with him is often exhilarating, experience has shown.

Still another factor, adopted only a couple of years ago, is that of the reading periods, when twice in the year for three or four weeks at a time courses and lectures cease and the student is required to read on his own account. These periods come after the student has made as much acquaintance as may be with the subjects he is studying, in order that he may read by himself intelligently, and hence they come at the end of the two terms. This brings them just before the semi-annual and final examinations in courses; but their object is by no means a preparation for those examinations, or a review; nor are they in general so used. Of course, I do not say that the weaker men may not so employ them to some extent, but that is not their object or their main use. New matter in the form of books to be read is given out, varying much with each student, and he is to do this work by himself, again with a view to self-education. Naturally such a plan can be applied only to men with a certain maturity, and hence it is not assigned to Freshmen nor used in the elementary courses. In fact, Freshmen in American colleges are not sufficiently prepared for work of a university character, and, therefore, with us they do not study with tutors or work toward a general examination. Most colleges with honor courses begin them only after the first two years; but we have thought that by means of entrance examinations and of pushing the Freshmen hard — at the cost of many dropped — we can get them to the point of beginning university methods of work in a single year. This is an experiment which, if it succeeds, is worth while, for three years of university methods are better than two.

Such is the background, or foundation, for the plan for residential Houses; and, in fact, long as this plan has been discussed, great as its advantages may be, it is doubtful whether we should have been wise in adopting it without that foundation solidly laid. A college generation is only four years; or rather, the whole population changes in that time; and one is constantly amused by the impression of undergraduates that some custom ought not to be reversed because it is believed by them to be of immemorial age, when it has, in fact, been in existence only half a dozen years. The shortness of generations enables a custom to be securely established in a few years. The general examination and the tutorial system, for example, have now been in use with us so long that the memory of students runneth not to the contrary. These things are now almost a venerable tradition, institutions inseparable from the oldest university in the country, and the reading periods are rapidly acquiring the same antiquity. If they continue to work well, no undergraduate who enters the first two Houses, and has not dropped a class, will have been in college when they were not in full use.

The effects of the foundation laid can easily be exaggerated; but it has certainly extended the conception that the object of college is to develop the capacity of the student to use his own mind, that is, self-education under guidance, as compared with getting through the courses required for a degree. Not unnaturally this is reflected in the increased number who strive to graduate with distinction. It has also brought a larger sense of the personal interest taken in the student, for the tutor comes into contact with him as a friend, and, as a whole, not merely in what he is doing in a particular course. It has made the Seniors a serious body. For them the great and final test is near at hand. If they are doubtful of passing, they are earnestly at work; if seeking distinction, they are still more so. Such an attitude on the part of the Seniors must be borne in mind in considering the value of lodging the three upper classes together in the communities we have termed Houses, for the Seniors have more influence on the Juniors and Sophomores than these younger men have on them.

Substantial as the foundation may be, the Houses could not have been built thereon had it not been for the fact that

Mr. Edward S. Harkness, quite unaware of our visions for the future, formed the opinion that a subdivision of a large American college on such lines would tend to solve many of its problems. He magnanimously offered to defray the cost involved, and he found at Harvard an enthusiastic welcome to his ideas.

The Houses are to be residential units. The courses of instruction, the requirements for a degree, the examinations, the college discipline outside of good order in the House, will be, as before, under the Faculty. So will the work of the tutors, for although this will be done as far as possible in the Houses, its nature and quality will remain under the supervision of the body of tutors for the department or division concerned. Nevertheless, the relation of the tutor to his pupil will be closer than ever, because, if unmarried, he will live and commonly take his meals in the same House as the pupil wherever that can be arranged; and if he lives with his family elsewhere he will have his room in the House, be a member of it, and expected to take a reasonable number of meals there. Of course this will not be always possible, for each House cannot contain tutors on every subject. But it will be true in a large number of cases; and the tutors connected with the House will be one of the ties that bind the community there together into an academic unity. Something will also be gained by attaching to each House a few professors who do not tutor, but will give it their support and be occasionally present at its table.

While the Houses ought not to be in all respects exactly alike, or precisely of the same size, they should in general be formed on a similar pattern. It is intended, therefore, that each should contain two hundred and fifty undergraduates, more or less, about equally divided among the three upper classes. They will be admitted to the House of Sophomores, and, although a transfer to another House for proper reasons may not be excluded, they will normally make it their home throughout the rest of their college course. They will be required to take, or rather to pay for — a less objectionable way of attaining the same practical result — a certain number of meals in the dining room every week. Each of them will have his own bedroom and study, or share the study with a chum.

The crucial point is the selection of the students for each House. No college in the country, perhaps in the world, has a larger variety of undergraduates, coming from more different kinds of schools, than Harvard. This renders the selection for each House more difficult, and at the same time offers a remarkable opportunity if successfully accomplished. More than a score of years ago, when Woodrow Wilson, as President of Princeton, was planning a division of the college into "Quads," as he called them, the writer asked him whether he proposed to allow the students to select their Quads, or compel them to go where he assigned them. He replied that they should not give up the power of compulsion. That was, in fact, the great dilemma in the plan, for if the boys on entering college were permitted to choose their Quads, those from the same school would all want to go together, or at least they would go with others from the same type of school and similar home surroundings. The result would be a segregation on a very unfortunate basis. If, on the other hand, they were compelled to go into Quads with few friends, and many strangers whom they supposed uncongenial, they would be likely to resent it, and to prefer some other college where the system did not exist. To us it seemed that such a compulsory mixing for a single year would not be resented, that it would be regarded very differently from an arbitrary assortment for the whole college course, and that at the end of that year many new attachments would have been formed among men who in a large college would not otherwise meet. That was the original motive for the Freshman Halls. Both of these anticipations have proved true. There has been no resentment at the compulsory assignment to the several Freshman Halls, although the policy of dividing those coming from the same school among different halls has been steadily pursued; while the formation of new friendships, the enlargement of social relations, has been notable.

At the time these Halls were projected the question of dividing the college into residential groups was as yet remote, but quite apart from such an ultimate object it was felt that to treat the Freshmen in this way had merits which made it eminently worth while, and the Halls were built. Now they can also serve the purpose for which they were first conceived, and there is all the more reason why separate halls for the Freshmen should be retained. This is contrary to the views of some good friends, who do not appreciate the obstacles to be surmounted in carrying out the House plan, and urge that it would be better to include the Freshmen in them. What may be possible at some future time, when the system has been so long in use as to create a firm tradition in the minds of prospective students, of their parents, and of headmasters of schools, is a different question.

Each House is intended to comprise, as nearly as may be, a cross-section of the whole residential membership of the college, to be selected by the Masters and their assistants from the applicants. I say from the applicants because there seems at present little doubt that for the two new Houses, to be finished in September, 1930, there will be more than applicants enough of all kinds; and when the plan is complete students are unlikely to want to be left out of a system substantially universal. I should add that the applications may be made individually or in groups of moderate size.

Naturally much will depend upon the personal qualities of the Masters; upon their judgment, tact, and forethought, both in selecting a body of members that will combine many different types, yet make a harmonious whole, and in imparting a wholesome and vigorous life to the House. In so doing they will derive much help from the upper classmen, and especially the Seniors, who will be able to promote enduring traditions and a sound corporate spirit. For this purpose it is important that, while there should be a keen sense of competition between the student bodies in the Houses in all worthy directions, the Masters should conduct them in co-operation for the common welfare of the college as a whole. Therein lies an advantage of this plan over that of the colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, which are distinct corporations with separate endowments and almost wholly independent in management; whereas our Houses will be absolutely under the ultimate control of the University authorities — no small restraint on selfishness or somnolence.

A keen sense of competition within these limits is, indeed, one of the vital elements in the plan as a stimulus to exertion. Intramural athletics will certainly be aided by the House plan. Each of them will have one or more crews on the river and its teams in other sports; thereby enlarging the number of men taking part, and ambitious to take part, in a match, and promoting the aim of physical culture for all. Each House, and especially the Master and tutors therein, will also desire to excel in the number of distinctions won by its members at graduation, thus bringing in something of a corporate or team element, instead of a personal one, in the striving for honors. Some years ago an athlete in an American college, whose marks did not justify his remaining there, expostulated with the President on the ground that he had been working for the college, whereas the high scholars had been working for their own personal benefit alone. A method whereby the glory of distinction redounds to the community as well as to the individual provides an incentive to which youth is distinctly susceptible, as was shown by the widespread interest in the prize offered by my sister, Mrs. William L. Putnam, for an intercollegiate contest, which took the form of a competition with Yale in an examination on English literature in the spring of 1928.

This paper is an attempt to set forth two things: one is what we are trying to do with the college, the other that the House Plan is not a separate departure in a new direction but a further step in the direction in which we have been striving to move, a capping stone, it has been said, to a policy. The object sought is self-education, the development of the faculties of each individual to the utmost by his own conscious effort. The four years of the college should be the period of entering into the life of the higher realms of thought, tastes, interests, and aspirations; the time for visions that never thereafter quite fade away. To that we believe the Houses can contribute by furnishing both opportunity and incentive. This is, of course, an experiment, and the motive force of experiments is enthusiasm and faith.

17

Norman Frank Coleman

FINGER POSTS OF COLLEGE PROGRESS

17

FINGER POSTS OF COLLEGE PROGRESS

Norman Frank Coleman

PRESIDENT OF REED COLLEGE, OREGON

OUR college and university life has been organized largely upon the traditional belief that the gaining of wisdom depends upon having nothing else to do. This tradition runs back at least two thousand years to the learned Jew of Alexandria who wrote, "The wisdom of the scribe cometh by the opportunity of leisure, and he that hath little business shall become wise." During the Middle Ages it took the form of disquisitions upon the superior advantages of the contemplative life as compared with the active life. In our own day it is fostered by members of college faculties who have themselves done nothing else but study and teach, and who easily assume that the wisdom by which men live is to be found in libraries and laboratories. In obedience to this tradition close to a million of America's most promising young men and women, in the time of their freshest energy, are set free from other duties and are allowed four or more years of leisure to become wise.

Through all the ages this process has been sufficiently successful to give continuing strength to the tradition, and it is measurably successful even to-day; but we now perceive that it is subject to the law of diminishing returns. Certainly the tradition is questioned among our people in these times more than it has ever been questioned before. Students question it and organize many forms of "business" (called student activities) to which they turn for the satisfaction they do not find in their studies. Parents question it and carry their questioning into the public press and into legislative committee rooms. Teachers question it and some forsake the contemplative life to go into politics or business, while others give themselves energetically to the development of a more effective educational process and the establishment of a better educational tradition.

The new movements in higher education take account first, of a far more general search for learning than has ever been known before, and second, of a growing conviction that the "wisdom of the scribe" is not sufficient but must be supplemented by the wisdom of the scientist, the explorer and the man of affairs. Old formulas are proving quite inadequate for the solution of present day problems. We are adopting as supplementary textbooks the monthly magazine and the daily paper.

Constructive criticism of the college by students, parents, and teachers, is seeking a new wisdom by which young men and women may live and work in the modern world. It recognizes that, in our rapidly changing society, authoritarian teaching is more and more discredited. Ex-cathedra utterances, from the professorial dais, sound to present day students ever thinner and further away, "like a tale of little meaning though the words are strong." The new wisdom is to be found by teachers and students at work together. The professor must come down from his platform to sit and talk with his students, and from time to time teacher and students together must, as in Galilee or Athens of old, fare forth into the marketplace.

It is perhaps impossible to summarize the various movements in our colleges and universities that seek in a frankly experimental way to promote free progress toward the wisdom needed for the tasks of the new generation. One may discern, however, three fairly clear directions of effort. There is a new emphasis upon *originality,* by which we mean fresh contact on the part of the student, through experience and imaginative insight, with the facts and processes of life. There is a new concern for *social understanding,* which depends upon ability to see the world through other people's eyes, to sense the qualities and ends of human endeavor as one's fellows realize them. There is, in the third place, a new appreciation of the growth of *character*, which consists in the discovery of the chief values of our common life and the organizing of one's powers for the preserving and the enhancing of these values. In the following pages, we shall attempt to explain the partial failure of our colleges to keep open these three ways to wisdom, and shall indicate some steps that are being taken in these three directions.

NOT *originality* but conformity has been the end of our college training hitherto. There was much pertinence in the question with which Mr. Dooley's college president greeted an applicant for admission, "Now my young friend, in what subjects would you like your thinking done for you by our learned professors?" Many a student of the past or even of the present generation can remember long, tedious hours devoted to taking down practically from dictation, facts that would have been much more interesting in their acquisition and more vital in their comprehension, if they had been gained by personal investigation. It is the deliberate judgment of a trained observer who spent two years at one of our larger universities, that conscientious undergraduates in that university are reduced to the condition of phonographic recording machines.

This situation arises from two causes, the enormous numbers of students that many of our teachers are expected to instruct, and the exaggerated importance the poorly trained teacher attaches to the instruction he gives. It is cheap and easy to instruct students in the mass, and it flatters the teacher's vanity to suppose that he can tell the students all they need to know. The truth is that *there is too much teaching and too little learning in our colleges.* Too often that teacher is held to be most successful who best succeeds in imposing his ideas upon the inexperienced and uncritical students before him. It was one of the most experienced teachers in our oldest university who propounded the conundrum, "Why is a college professor reading examination papers like a dog eating sausages?" The answer is, "Because he is consuming his own substance in mangled form." In some courses in some institutions it is not considered good form for the student to ask questions of the instructor. To do so is to evince an indecent interest in the subject matter of the course, and it leads to the suspicion that the questioner wishes to gain unfair advantage in the matter of class standing.

Gradually, but too slowly, all this is being changed. Courses in Independent Reading, Honors Courses, Discussion Groups, Tutorial and Preceptorial methods, in a score of widely scattered and varied institutions, are encouraging the student to think for himself. Well trained and forward looking college instructors are confessing their own knowledge to be imperfect and are encouraging their students, upon grounds of independent investigation and reflection, to disagree with them. They are assisting students gradually to take charge of their own education. They are engaged in the delicate and significant task of making themselves unnecessary.

In this direction, eighteen years of continuous experimentation in Reed College suggest that the best results in original thinking may be secured when the instructional group is from seven to seventeen in number, when the classroom is small and is furnished with a table surrounded by movable chairs, when no publicity is given to class ratings or examination results, and when graduation depends not upon the accumulation of a fixed number of credits but upon the completion of an organized and unified program of study. In the experience of Reed College it has become clearer year by year that a high proportion of its students may profitably pursue courses of independent reading and investigation; more than a third of the students enrolled are pursuing such courses this year. In the final year each student prepares and submits a thesis based upon a course of independent study, and undergoes a two-hour comprehensive oral examination. In this examination effort is made to test not merely his knowledge of ascertained facts, but his ability to express and to defend judgments based upon his own thinking.

At the heart of this program has been the purpose to present education as a process taking place within the student, producing change in him and determining the quality of his life. This means the gradual and persistent uprooting of the widely prevalent notion that a college education is progress toward a degree, recorded in the registrar's office by a summation of credits earned by repeating as nearly as possible what the instructors and the textbooks have said. Only those who have struggled over a series of years against this educational superstition can have any idea how readily undergraduates adopt it. An interesting and rather typical example is the recent case of a bright and industrious upper class student of one of our western universities, preparing himself for a business career, who reported that he had just completed a two-hour course in Artillery. When his friends enquired why on earth he took a course in Artillery, he replied, "Oh, I needed the two credits, and this was an easy way to get them." He appeared to have no sense of the unreality of a college education pursued in this spirit. He was going through the curricular machine in the prescribed way.

It is not sufficient to charge such thoughtlessness and superficiality against the faults of our general society and to remark upon the prevalence of the motive "to get by" in business and politics. If business and politics are themselves to be saved from decay, they must be subjected to a continual fire of honest and original criticism. Where are informed and intelligent critics to come from if not from our colleges? If colleges have any clear function to justify their enormous expenditure of time and money, it surely lies in the training of young people to be useful and dependable citizens; useful in the purifying and renovating of our institutions, dependable for the penetration of shams and the discovery of realities.

SEEKING, in the second place, *social understanding* in college, one encounters the ancient tradition of academic seclusion. Every reader of Chaucer's Prologue has been charmed by its delineation of the Oxford Scholar, with his devotion to logic, his preference for philosophy over rich robes and gay music, and his eagerness to learn and to teach. A gentle, selfless, devoted, aspiring, unworldly man he was, such as may yet be found, here and there, in college faculties. One admires and yet pities him, he knows so much of books and so little of people. One smiles indulgently as one reads his story of the patient

Griselda, and wonders if he really supposed such a woman possible.

Such scholars have their own charm and their own place, but they should be few. Modern America cannot be expected to provide leisure and libraries to make any considerable proportion of its million students into such inept and insulated gentlemen as this. Nevertheless conditions survive in our college life which foster less charming and equally serious ineptitude. One asks, for example, what is being done to lead our college students into wisdom with regard to the changing relations of tool-owners and tool-users in modern industry, of men and women in the modern family, and of the white and the colored races in the modern world. These are vital matters, holding for these young people the issues of happiness and sorrow, victory and defeat, life and death.

There is something incongruous in the industrial ignorance and inexperience of many of our college students. They are mature in their bodies, at their keenest in intellect, self-possessed and confident in matters of social usage, but frequently they have never earned a dollar and have no sense of the burden of toil that rests upon the shoulders of others. Surely, as young people achieve maturity in other directions, they should gradually be inducted into economic responsibility. The real world is a working world. One lives in a kind of delayed childhood until one has learned where and how to lay hold upon this reality.

Happily a large number of students in all our colleges have experience of toil. Many of them, in whole or in part, are working their way through. Among these are to be found our most eager, capable, and influential students. But as their toil is rarely integrated with their other educational activities, it is likely to seem and to be a digression, an interruption, a necessary evil, which the student endures in order that he may make progress toward the good life. Antioch College is almost the only institution of higher education which requires for practically all its students a program of correlated work and study. Antioch's situation is special, both in its advantages and its disadvantages, but its experience and achievements are of great significance and point a direction in which many other experiments should be made. The theoretical studies of society, which have been so greatly expanded in the recent development of our college curricula, need practical social contacts and responsibilities to give them significance and reality. Here scholarship, if it is to bring wisdom, must go out from the classroom into the counting-house, the factory, and the mine.

In this matter of industrial relations, so provisional, so varied, so pregnant with change, it is doubly important that students should have free field for investigation and wide range in the hearing and the discussion of opinion; yet the authorities of many colleges have chosen this field for repression and exclusion. One is reminded by contrast of the wisdom of the elder Armour, who is said to have recommended the admission of socialist and communist speakers to the Institute which bears his name. "Perhaps," he said, "there is something in these teachings, and if there is, I want my boys to be among the first to find it out." The experience of Reed College in offering an open forum for the serious presentation of all sorts of social, economic and religious theories, indicates that such theories are subject to coolest appraisal in an atmosphere of tolerance and hospitality. It is surprising how sanely critical of supposedly dangerous doctrines students are, when they have entire freedom to hear and to discuss such doctrines. Observing this, over a series of years, one is led to conclude with Milton: "Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter?"

When one ventures upon the changing relations of men and women one must walk warily. In no other field is generalization more dangerous and in no other field are facts more difficult to discover and to verify. The ancient poet showed rare insight in likening the way of a man with a maiden to three things most wonderful and most difficult to follow, "the way of an eagle in the air, the way of a serpent on the rock, and the way of a ship in the midst of the sea." Two opinions, however, one may safely venture; first, when it comes to being understood by the opposite sex, men and women take a lot of knowing; and second, there is a great body of experience, successful and unsuccessful, upon which the student should be able to draw in his search for wisdom.

On the score of its multiplied opportunities for understanding, coeducation in college and university seems to justify itself. It certainly has won its way in the Occident, and is winning its way even in the Orient. Women students are crowding into colleges and universities in Japan, China, and India, and they are being welcomed by the men. If one expresses surprise that women students should be welcomed in seats of learning hitherto exclusively occupied by men, one is assured that educated young men in the Orient to-day are eager for the education of young women so that they may find wives "with whom they can talk." The modern home calls for the sharing of interests and aims. These young men are seeking life partners in an enterprise the longest, the most difficult, and the most rewarding of all that are undertaken under the sun. Such partnership demands intelligence of both its members. Still more it demands kinship of spirit deeper than is likely to be revealed in casual association on a superficial level of social enjoyment. If men and women are to live together happily, they must understand each other. There seems no better way to promote that understanding than to give them opportunity over an extended period of time, to talk, work, and play together on the basis of mutual respect and good comradeship.

It should be possible to supplement this practical acquaintance with guidance drawn from the experience of older generations, but apparently teachers are not yet free enough from old inhibitions and are not clear enough in their own minds to share with students the fruits of their observation and experience. Physiology, Psychology, and Sociology do indeed speak on this subject but as yet rather confusedly.

As an attempt to furnish scientific guidance in these intimate domestic matters, the Euthenics Courses and Summer Institute of Vassar College are interesting and encouraging. These frankly recognize home-making as one of the major occupations of men and women. They study the changing status and relations of the family, and they recognize the presence of the child as a central and continuing fact. If, as seems probable, men and women learn most quickly to live together when they are joined in common tasks and responsibilities, then care of children gives greatest promise of happy and permanent homes. In the Vassar Summer Institute young wives and mothers study the complex problems of the family. It is a happy omen that over week-ends many of the husbands and fathers join the group for study, for discussion, and for instruction by experts in child psychology and hygiene, and in domestic economy. This is one way in which the American home may be strengthened against the strains imposed upon it by modern industrial life.

In their attitude toward the peoples of other lands Americans are slowly escaping from the bonds of provincialism. The changed attitude of our college students in the past fifteen years has been little short of a revolution. From the smug complacency and indifference of an earlier time they have become curious, venturesome and receptive. Students of Pacific Northwest colleges and universities, for example, have held two annual conferences, by their own motion and under their own management, which were attended by equal numbers of representatives of white and colored races. In these conferences the political, economic, and social relations of the white and the colored races have been discussed with the utmost frankness. Round-table face-to-face discussions of this nature have seemed so clearly worth while that it has been decided to repeat the conferences indefinitely. Every new generation of Northwest students will, it is hoped, deal with the continuing difficulties of race contact with fresh vigor and in clearer light.

These students have not blinked the difficulties involved in social intercourse between people of diverse races, nor the economic friction and political dangers engendered by race contacts. They have simply faced the world as it is and as it will be, and have proposed if possible to understand each other so that they may live in peace and mutual helpfulness.

Our special American race problem becomes more urgent year by year and we become more dissatisfied with the brusque, makeshift solution that was worked out at the close of our Civil War. It becomes evident that here, as elsewhere, there is no permanent possibility of diverse races living together in the relation of superior and inferior. Some progress is being made in the friendly and equitable adjustment of relations between white and black Americans, chiefly through joint councils of the two races. Only through such coöperation can a satisfactory *modus vivendi* be worked out. It is probably desirable that the larger student numbers of the two races should be segregated; but the colleges which exclude all members of the colored race are limiting their students' opportunities for a very vital kind of education. Here, as in so many other cases, a policy of educational exclusion may be as hurtful to those who are shut in as to those who are shut out. To suppose that one's own race is self-sufficient and has nothing to learn in association, on grounds of mutual respect, with another race, is to narrow one's own horizon and darken one's own vision.

It is a common experience that people of other races are judged impossible to live with, until we have met members of those races of character and attainments commanding admiration. These are for us the natural ambassadors and interpreters of an alien culture, breaking down prejudice and opening the ways of understanding and coöperation. American colleges and universities have too few such ambassadors and interpreters.

CONSIDERING *character* as a third end of college education we find a marked change in recent years. It was once possible for a college student's mother to write to the Dean and ask him to see that her son was up *and washed* by eight o'clock each morning. That time has gone by. It is no longer easily assumed that one generation may fairly form the character of the next by imposing upon it an established code of conduct. Compulsory attendance at chapel, or even at classes, required courses in Bible, and the careful regulation of student amusements have not produced satisfactory results in student character. The pendulum has been swinging the other way, and it has been possible in recent years for a Dean to declare in public that it is as useless to expect a University to produce character in students as to expect a eucalyptus tree to produce figs. In so far as this attitude represents reaction from the conception of character as conformity to a prescribed code, this is a healthy sign. In so far as it regards the pursuit of character values in college as unimportant or impracticable, it is mistaken or cowardly or both.

Character formation is essentially the integrating of desires and purposes, the achieving of a principle of unity in the unfolding life. This is at the very heart of education. Without this all our schooling of young people will be fruitless or will produce only apples of Sodom, bitter to the taste and poisonous to our commonwealth. Let it be granted that the concentrating and directing of the powers of mind and soul involved in the formation of character, is an inward process only indirectly influenced by teachers and courses of study. Let it be understood that few thoughtful educators nowadays have faith in the efficacy of exhortations and homilies to prepare young people for the choices of the new day. There yet remain powerful influences which the colleges may and do exert upon the maturing characters of their students. Let us consider two of these, the matter of honesty, and the matter of responsibility.

NOTHING is more disintegrating to character, more destructive to unity of life, than the development of strong yet inconsistent purposes. Among older people we may occasionally find one who complacently and with some success faces both ways; but the state of the young person who attempts to do this, suffers from continuous civil strife. Our students are in the main well intentioned and conscientious, yet there is an amazing amount of dishonest work done in our colleges and universities. Students would worship Truth, but they would worship also the goddess of Getting On. They would say what they think, but they would say also what they think the professors expect them to think. This conflict is apt to be most devastating in the minds of the most talented and original students. Some of these yield to the pressure of the system and stultify their intellectual consciences for reward, while others become active rebels and so cut themselves off from academic preferment. The professors are usually unconscious of the wrong that is being done.

They have frequently such large numbers of students that they can use only wholesale methods of testing their achievements. Besides, they are themselves products of the system and hence are apt to be uncritical of the way it works. It should be said that it does not always work badly. With many teachers and students honest results are doubtless secured. On the other hand there is much sham and pretense, much dishonest setting forth of opinions not really held, much covering up of perfunctory effort with a show of devotion to scholarship.

In Reed College there is a strong feeling among faculty and students that the publishing of grades and standings fosters this kind of insincerity. Our best students are frequently the most earnest in their criticism of class and examination marks as tests of essential progress or achievement. They have objected to the faculty provision for special recognition of a few students each year who attain class standings of unusually high average; and in response to their objection, the custom has been discontinued. Some students and some teachers have even expressed the desire that we might do away with grades altogether, and if it were not for the need of a record of grades for those who transfer to other institutions, this would probably be done.

Another field of college activity in which double standards are erected is the field of athletics. Here also there is destructive conflict between profession and performance. Abundant evidence of this has been recently published. The hurt to student character does not arise from the hiring of athletes, directly or indirectly. There is no more harm in hiring a man to play football than there is in hiring him to play in an orchestra. The harm comes from hiring athletes while the institution professes to be doing something very different. The dishonesty involved goes further than the coach and the alumni and the president, who may be in collusion to deceive the public; it frequently involves the whole student body, who connive at professional athletics in the guise of amateur for the sake of victory and the financial returns. Happily college students in many parts of the country are becoming disgusted with the fraud and are losing interest in pep rallies and parades before the game and the other devices which have been used to arouse popular enthusiasm and swell the receipts. It may be that in a few years the athletic exploitation of *bona fide* students will be at an end. The administrations which need the money, and the alumni who wish to lay safe wagers on the team, and the bankers who hold the stadium bonds may organize their own teams and conduct their own athletic business without interfering with the essential work of the colleges. When that day comes, students will engage in sports for physical training, mental discipline, social experience, and the fun of the game. They will no longer be under pressure to support a system which, in their hearts, they know to be false.

From time to time we read in our newspapers how college students here and there have staged a riot, destroyed property and battled with the police. We wonder why young men usually well-mannered and inoffensive should suddenly break out into wild disorder. Perhaps they do so just because they are usually so mild-mannered and inoffensive. Consider their ordinary academic life. They are herded from lecture room to laboratory and back again, they occupy numbered seats so that their presence may be checked by attendance monitors, they sit in examination halls under the watchful eyes of teachers and proctors, they are told what to think and what to say. What wonder if occasionally they compensate for all this undistinguished conformity by outbreaks in which they assert themselves, attract attention, say to the world, "Here we are, look at us, hear us yell!"

As a matter of fact when college students are treated like men, they usually behave like men. There is nothing like responsibility for developing character, if the responsibility comes gradually, in an atmosphere of friendly trust. It is often observed in home life that young people show surprising advance in maturity when they have their own work to do and are trusted to do it. This is especially true at the usual college age, when social impulses are strong, and the young man and woman taste the satisfaction of having friends and comrades depend upon them for help or protection. The sense of responsibility helps the youth to concentrate his efforts, to unify his purposes, to form his character.

It has been abundantly proved that under favorable conditions college students can be trusted gradually to take charge of themselves educationally; then why continue to treat them as if they were yet in the kindergarten? They must take charge of themselves ultimately, meet their own engagements, discharge their own obligations, form their own opinions, "go on their own steam." What fitter place than the college to learn this self-reliance? For eighteen years at Reed College there has been no reporting of class attendance, no artificial penalty for absence, no faculty supervision of examinations; yet there is general agreement by the teachers that there is less cutting of classes, and less cheating at examinations than they have observed elsewhere.

The reader has doubtless perceived that the foregoing suggestions for the improvement of College and University education make large demands upon the teacher. A most encouraging sign of recent years is the awakening of our leaders in Higher Education to the necessity of such demands. If these are to be met, college teachers must be selected with greater care and trained with clearer purpose. If we are to develop originality and social understanding and character in college students, their teachers must be men and women of wider and deeper experience than many of those who have gone directly and as a matter of course from graduate schools into our faculties. There is a growing and insistent need for college teachers of special fitness in character as well as in intellectual furnishing, teachers, moreover, who have considered the special problems of Higher Education in America and are trained in a broadly professional way to grapple with them. Too many of those now applying for positions in college faculties are narrowly specialized, academic, and doctrinaire in their outlook upon the young life that floods our campuses. We need more accurate and comprehensive scholarship and we shall get it; but our greatest need will be less readily met. It is indicated in the dictum of one of our most distinguished and original college teachers. "The three most important qualifications for a teacher in College or University are first, Character, second, Character, and third, Character."

18

Robert Devore Leigh

THE NEWEST EXPERIMENT IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

18

THE NEWEST EXPERIMENT IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Robert Devore Leigh

PRESIDENT OF BENNINGTON COLLEGE, BENNINGTON, VERMONT

EXPERIMENT in undergraduate education is being carried out in at least three different institutional media. Piecemeal changes in curriculum, method, and organization are being adopted in our leading institutions and are spreading rapidly and widely by the process of imitation. Most of these institutions, having traditions, personnel, designated funds, and conflicting faculty opinions "must be content to experiment in spots or at any rate to try one experiment at a time." A few institutions only, under vigorous, individual leadership have rather boldly set forth on the road of thoroughgoing experiment with a consciously defined and unified purpose. Such thoroughgoing programs are, however, usually limited to academic utopias existing in blueprint and prospectus or between the covers of books and magazines. In this form there are no accumulations of commitments, vested departmental interests, outworn plant, and outdated faculty to hinder the proposal of a clean-cut, purposeful experiment along modern lines.

One of this last type, which gives promise of emerging from plan to actual operation, is the Bennington College project. It was first initiated as a result of a series of conferences of educators to consider the shortage of facilities then existing for the higher education of women in the Northeast, which revealed the favorable opportunity thus afforded for a thoroughgoing experiment in college education for women. It escaped falling into the hands of a local group with limited outlook, or coming under the dictation of a single donor with dogmatic conceptions or personal idiosyncrasies. Its program has been gradually matured over a period of six years. An early groundwork was laid by a field study of higher education in the United States and Europe made for a group of its trustees by Miss Amy Kelly. As a result of a second survey, many interviews, memoranda, conferences, and public meetings, the Educational Plan for the College was issued in a preliminary draft, April, 1929, and published in the following December. What follows is largely a restatement of this published program.

The Plan is not so much the formulation of an individual innovator's educational philosophy as of the need for an institution of its type felt and expressed by schools, educators, and parents. But although most of its features have been suggested by specific school or college experience, the plan is not a mere assembling of unrelated changes. It calls for the creation of a changed spirit and attitude among students and faculty and necessarily implies a new institution built from the ground up with faculty and students chosen especially for the purpose.

The primary reason for the new college is found in the present situation of the so-called progressive schools. Starting at the bottom of the educational ladder a generation or more ago these institutions have grown in numbers, support, and influence until to-day they represent one of the most significant movements in our educational system. In many respects their faith and philosophy have been justified not only by their individual experiments but also by psychological analysis and scientific measurement of school processes, the other notable features of the same period.

The progressive schools, discarding the medieval intellectualist tradition, have insisted on dealing with the whole personality of the child; modern psychological analysis points plainly to the necessity for this broader attitude if we are to promote through the schools either usefulness or happiness.

The newer schools have taken the individual as a starting point in making school programs; scientific studies, by showing objectively the enormous differences between individuals both in ability and in tastes, have fortified them in this viewpoint. The experimental schools have stressed the values of direct experience and pupil activity as well as a content vitally related to contemporary social life in giving meaning and interest to the learning process; scientific studies and psychological experiment, by breaking down the false values attached to formal discipline in older subject matter and by relating discipline to the drive for a desired end, have abundantly justified this approach. The progressive schools have set up as aims: initiative, self-expression, creative work, independent reasoning, self-dependence, adjustment to a changing environment; from a number of sources comes authoritative confirmation of this emphasis.

We are now approaching a period when the progressive schools and the scientific students of education must ally themselves even more closely in the common effort to evaluate the newer methods carefully and impartially to the end that their valid features may gradually be extended into general public school practice. In this situation, however, progressive schools find themselves severely handicapped. The newer school program can proceed in a thoroughgoing fashion only up to the point where the college reaches down with its formal admissions requirements; from that point on the progressive schools have had to modify their own chosen programs in the interest of their students' immediate future. And it is just at this point that the newer methods and spirit begin to have their greatest capacity for evaluation. Only the continuance of such work through the secondary school and college can test their validity. For here initiative, self-dependence, honest artistic expression, and ability to think independently, can be measured by adult standards and proved by mature accomplishment. There is needed at least one college, with ample funds and high-grade teaching personnel, which by the nature of its entrance requirements will leave the schools free to teach what they think best; which will in its own program emphasize individuality, direct experience, serious interest, initiative, creative and independent work, and self-dependence as educational aims.

This does not necessarily mean that such a college should limit itself to the graduates of progressive schools or that it should uncritically adopt progressive school technique. Surprising interest and support for such a new college for women have come also from the heads of traditional schools who see the need of more freedom for advanced instruction and of more individually discriminating entrance requirements for students of specialized ability. In a very real sense the Bennington project is fashioned out of the demands coming from an active, influential minority among parents and teachers in schools of various kinds.

Briefly, Bennington says to girls in all types of schools: Have you serious interest and real promise in at least one of the fields of human achievement in which we offer instruction? If so you may enter with us upon a period in which you may test that interest in the light of other interests while we assess your ability. If your competence is proved and your interest is sustained, you may go ahead under expert guidance with work in your field of choice as widely and as deeply and as far as possible. No traditional, formal requirements or rules of residence will stand in the way of your getting the best instruction. No mere satisfaction of rules of class attendance, reading of specified books, or accumulation of course credits will suffice. Your degree will be given on the basis of a demonstration that you have learned how to stand on your own feet and to work with skill and understanding in your chosen field.

The object of the Bennington admissions system is to discover and to admit girls of serious interest and of unusual promise in one or more of the four major fields into which serious human achievement is rather artificially divided for practical purposes: *i.e.*, literature, the fine arts, the natural sciences, and the social studies. Such girls are not to be found in any one type of school, one part of the country, or one group in society. Nor are they discovered merely by setting up minimum standards attained through certification or examination in a group of rigidly defined subjects of formal school study.

Fortunately the accumulating experience of those colleges which, since the War, have introduced a system of selective admission, as well as scientific studies of the problem,[1] indicate clearly the best procedure for a college in which no traditional or curricular limitations stand in the way of a realistic search for the students best qualified to profit by a college education. These studies show, first, that the quality of school work, as shown by grades and recommendations, irrespective of the subjects studied, gives the most reliable prediction of college success; second, that no one set of impersonal tests, grades or recommendations is as reliable as a judgment upon the basis of all the evidence available regarding each candidate's past performance, quality, and promise.

Consequently Bennington will assign to an expert Director of Admissions the sole task of selecting the entrants to its Freshman class upon the basis of the following: (a) quality of the school record; (b) score on a scholastic aptitude test such as that now given by the College Entrance Examination Board and, where the school's standard of grading or accuracy of recommendations is unknown, an achievement test in one of the subjects in which the student has done her best work; (c) such general records, judgments, and personal history revealing indications of purpose, range and quality of interests, traits of character and personality, as can be obtained from school officials, parents, and other persons familiar with the candidate's out-of-school record, and from the candidate herself. Whenever it is not prohibitive on account of distance a personal interview with the applicant will be held.

The comparative weight to be given the various factors in the student's record will be left to the Director of Admissions, who will be able gradually to perfect her prediction devices by observing over a period of years their actual results in undergraduate success or failure.

Creditable completion of a secondary school course is the necessary minimum for entrance to Bennington, but it is not a guarantee of admission.[2] The requirements are not stated in terms of a standard group of fifteen units in which students may be certified or pass examinations. The content and methods of work in the schools are left to the schools themselves, where they properly belong in this period of fruitful educational reconstruction. And by this means the College is able to create the largest possible area for selection, including the graduates of private preparatory schools, public high schools, and experimental schools throughout the country.

---

[1] Studies of results of various admission criteria at the University of Minnesota, at Leland Stanford Jr. University, and elsewhere.

We know statistically that most able students are able in most things. And at Bennington, as elsewhere, students with uniformly good records will be welcome. But a goodly proportion of girls have unusual aptitudes in one field combined with what may be called temporary or permanent intellectual "blind spots" in others. Girls with such specialized ability will be encouraged to seek entrance. No one will be kept out merely because she has not succeeded in a single subject such as Mathematics, Latin, or French. Ability in the fine arts will not be obscured merely because it does not lend itself to school tests or grading. Indeed a special aptitude in one line will give a candidate preference over another whose record is more uniform but mediocre in quality. The single emphasis is upon quality rather than upon a standard minimum in a varied group of subjects and the quantitative accumulation of credits.

Under this method of individual selection the Director of Admissions can in most cases make a decision regarding a student's application a year before the completion of her secondary school course. In the unusual circumstance that such a student in her last school year reveals weaknesses previously not apparent, the College will reserve the right to cancel the preliminary admission.

The admissions system aims not merely at cutting off the least qualified candidates at the bottom of the list of applications. Bennington will seek positively to attract students of initiative, independence, maturity, and stirring ambition. Girls with these qualities are likely to be attracted to such a college.

---

[2] In unusual cases persons of maturity, serious purpose, and especial excellence who have not had formal or regular schooling will be admitted.

Its peculiar financial system makes possible the use of scholarships for this purpose.

If one were to be told that existing colleges give all students — rich and poor, promising and unpromising — a scholarship covering one-half or more of the actual cost of instruction it would be a strange practice. Yet this is precisely the effect of the prevailing system of fixing tuition charges at one-half or less of the current instruction cost. Under the Bennington plan students will be charged as tuition their full share of the current instruction costs, estimated to be $850-$875, exclusive of room and board. As a necessary corollary, scholarships and loan funds must be provided to defray part or all of the tuition for those who need and deserve such pecuniary aid. It is estimated that this group will constitute approximately one-quarter of the student body. But girls of limited means, whose opportunities for self-help and later remunerative employment are greater than is the case with boys, are not likely, in any numbers, to enter a college whose tuition fee is twice that of other reputable institutions, with only the hope that after a semester of successful work a scholarship may be granted them to reduce the tuition charge. Consequently the usual method of semi-annual scholarship awards after entrance is inappropriate.

The Bennington plan is, therefore, to award scholarships to prospective students carefully selected for their promise of distinguished college success. As in the case of the Rhodes Scholarships, the original award will imply its renewal each year of the student's college course unless her work proves unsatisfactory.

For a large proportion of the scholarships there will be a selective award made on a regional basis. The country will be divided into twelve natural regions in each of which a scholarship of $1,000 (sufficient to cover full tuition charges and traveling expenses from any part of the country to Bennington) will be awarded once a year. In each region a committee of educators and laymen will be organized to make the annual nomination. The actual award will be made by the College Director of Admissions, who will reserve the right to refuse the award in any year in any region when the nominated candidate does not appear to be properly qualified. The regional committees, aided by teachers and other workers with young people in almost every community, will naturally be interested in seeking out girls of demonstrated talent and in urging them to apply for nomination as regional scholars.

That many young women will welcome such an opportunity there is little doubt. Studies such as that of the *High School Seniors in Massachusetts*[3] indicate that with all the opportunity for the discovery and development of unusual talent implied in our free school system there remains an appreciable number of young people of excellent quality who, for economic reasons, do not go to college at all. More commonly young people of limited means do go to college; but to a nearby local institution with meager equipment and mediocre faculty rather than to the college which their talents deserve. Selective four-year scholarships will open up to some of these unusually competent girls opportunity for greater individual attention, closer faculty contact, higher standards of achievement, wider horizons, and more stimulating association with girls from other parts of the country than would otherwise be possible. And to the opportunity for friendly contacts and exchange of ideas and attitudes, characteristic of the small residential college, these girls will add something of the valuable diversity of background of the large university.

In order to insure that the machinery of award will be continuously adjusted to the primary task of discovering young women of exceptional ability there will be a central advisory committee associated with the College Director of Admissions upon which will be represented the principal national organizations of women and girls. This board will assist in the creation and revision of the personnel of the regional committees and will be given power to recommend from time to time changes in the machinery and conditions of selection.

It is also hoped to have from the beginning a half dozen or more selective foreign scholarships with the larger annual stipend of $1,600. For the nomination of students from foreign lands to receive these scholarships, excellent machinery, such as that of the Institute of International Education, already exists and can be utilized by Bennington.

---

[3] By Dr. McPhail of Brown University; published by the U. S. Bureau of Education; also studies of secondary school graduates made by the University of Minnesota.

It should be noted in passing that the Bennington curriculum, admissions system, and scholarship system depend organically upon one another. The absence of requirement that all students take Latin, Mathematics or a foreign language in Freshman year makes possible an admissions system based on quality of work rather than on a uniform list of formal subjects, thus opening the doors to girls from schools with widely varying curricula. In turn this makes possible a scholarship system in which selection is made on equal terms over the broadest possible area. In the case of visiting foreign students both the admissions system and the flexible curriculum make much easier the combining of undergraduate work in the United States with the later work in the home university.

A first principle of the College is to recognize the very real differences between individual students in previous work, in maturity, and in essential purposes. Some students will know perfectly well at entrance what they want to do and will have good reasons for doing it. Others will come to college with temporary enthusiasms, preferences, and aversions based upon inadequate school experience. Still others, although of good general intellectual ability, will as yet have developed no well-defined purposes, preferences, intellectual or æsthetic interests. A uniform first two years of work required of all these students would do violence to the immediate educational needs of a large proportion of them. Consequently, for this period the work will be individually arranged by deliberate conference between college officers and each student, rather than generally required. This does not mean an unrestricted elective system; the student's program is to be based upon a careful analysis of her present needs, aptitudes, and interests in the light of her previous school experience, as well as upon a proper anticipation of the requirements necessary for later college work in the field of her preliminary major choice.

The primary objective set clearly before every student immediately after entrance is to discover for herself the field of human achievement in which she possesses a marked interest combined with distinct competence. The general pattern of work for the first two years will be designed to aid her in this quest. In both the first year and the second year a course in each of the four major fields of instruction suggested above will be offered. Although the detailed content and method of these courses can be defined only after the instructors have worked out their joint program, the work now done in some of the colleges under the heading of orientation courses will be of help in understanding their purpose. But many such courses, by providing an extensive and cursory survey of a vast body of knowledge, miss the essential method of work in the field which they attempt to introduce. This will be avoided at Bennington. In fact, one of the primary objects of the Bennington introductory courses is to reveal the techniques characteristic of the several fields. In the sciences this will mean the laboratory method, not, however, routine work of a purely preparatory nature; in the fine arts, creation or expression as well as appreciation; in literature, the comprehensive, active understanding of great masterpieces rather than detailed or superficial literary history; in the social studies the careful, intensive, realistic, impartial analysis of contemporary problems.

Each introductory course must also have a content carefully selected to reveal the significance of achievement in that particular field. In most cases it will cover more than one academic department of knowledge. (It may seem best in some fields, however, as, for instance, the sciences, to maintain four semester courses dealing in sequence with Geology, Physics, Chemistry and Biology.) Necessarily the content of a course must be a representative sample rather than an encyclopedic survey.

In the work of both the first two years an effort will be made, so far as is practicable, to correlate the four courses round a cultural epoch. It is planned to have the general subject of the first year, or even first two years, an attempt to understand modern western civilization — its literature, its art, its political, economic, and scientific bases. In such a program there are possibilities of breaking down barriers not only between departments and between fields of knowledge but also between the curriculum and the extra curricular activities. The literary, artistic, and dramatic life of the undergraduates during these years may make ingenious contributions to the problem of understanding the culture about which they are studying.

In addition to the two-year program of four courses a year, there will be for each student the equivalent of a fifth course called the trial major conference. This is an informal group attached to each of the introductory courses. Every student will, at the outset, as a result of conference and guidance make a tentative choice of her major field. This selection will determine the particular trial major conference group she is to enter. If experience dictates a change of major interest she will be transferred to another conference group. These conference groups will pursue work differentiated from that done by those taking the introductory course for exploratory purposes. They will serve to carry the student as rapidly as feasible into the more individual and more informal methods characteristic of the last two college years. They will provide a content especially suited to those students who will go on to advanced work in each field. They will also offer abundant opportunity for the instructors in each major field of the curriculum to assess the ability of the undergraduates proposing to do major work in that field.

During the first two years "tool courses" such as mathematics and the foreign languages will be available for those who plan to do advanced work requiring their use. They will not be required of all. The command of written and spoken English is, of course, an essential tool in all branches of college work. At Bennington, however, this training will not be carried on as a separate course but by tutorial or conference methods in connection with the material of other courses. For students whose secondary school work in any field makes unnecessary one or more of the general introductory courses and who do not need any special "tool courses," advanced work in the line of their interest will be made available at once.

Thus while there is a general pattern for the work of the first two years each individual student's program will vary from this pattern to meet her particular needs.

The test for passage from the Junior Division (first two years) of the College to the Senior Division (last two years) will be simple and definite. It will depend solely upon giving clear evidence of distinct ability in one of the four major fields, not at all upon the accumulation of a certain number of credits or grades. Failure to do satisfactory work in one or more courses outside of the field of the student's choice will not disqualify or delay her. The specific object of the introductory courses is the exploration of the major fields to discover permanent interests and competence. That object is attained outside the major chosen as truly by failure as by success. But unless a student does distinctly creditable work in at least one course during both her first and second years, and unless she meets the obligation of effort required by her instructors, it is likely that she will be asked to leave college.

Admission to the advanced work of the Senior Division for a few students may be made at entrance to college and for some others at the end of the first year. The College will be interested in the kind of coöperation with secondary schools which, by providing an earlier orientation, will make this possible. On the other hand there may be students who because of a false start, delayed maturity, or for other reasons, will need and will desire a third year in the Junior Division in order to prove their capability and to make certain of their interest in a major field. No objection will be made to this plan so long as the two-year record indicates likelihood of real success in the third year. It will naturally not diminish the requirement of advanced work in the Senior Division before the award of the degree.

What percentage of the student body will be eliminated by the test for entrance to the Senior Division cannot be foretold. The admissions system is designed to attract the girl whose record and attitude give promise of proving competence in a major field. Every student from the day she enters will know that it is her responsibility to find her interest and to demonstrate her ability if she is to remain in college beyond the first two years. The courses and the instructors will assist her in this task. It is likely, therefore, that as large a proportion of Bennington students will qualify for advanced work as at existing colleges where progress depends mainly upon the amassing of course credits. In any case a system which permits students who have not found definite intellectual interests in which they have real ability to proceed to advanced work leads to waste or misdirection of energy for all concerned.

For all students the work of the Senior Division will be similar in nature to the honors work now arranged for selected students in some of our better colleges. Every upperclassman will be enrolled directly under the supervision of the instructor or instructors in the field of her choice. Although the precise arrangement will vary with the major chosen it will be characterized in almost all cases by individual enterprises or projects involving continuous periods in the laboratory, studio, library, or field, checked by informal group conferences meeting once a week or less. No daily round of class assignments will interfere with effective continuity so desirable for advanced work. There will be a variety of individual and group arrangements impossible where such opportunities are strictly limited by a highly organized machinery of requirements and attendance in four or five courses. This is the medium in which self-dependence and initiative in intellectual or artistic work can best be promoted. These qualities are fundamental rather than incidental aims of the college.

The field of major interest in practically every case will be broader than any single academic department. It may be organized round a present interest leading to a future adult activity. Bennington has no sympathy with the false antithesis between vocational and liberal studies. The problem is that of gaining a broad, thorough preparation in a field of important adult activity where there is a real and lasting enthusiasm and interest. Whether in the after-college future this field will be entered as a full-time occupation, whether it is to be carried on as an avocation in connection with the vocation of parenthood is almost impossible for a young woman to forecast. And fortunately it is not always necessary to do so. The older professions, public affairs and international relations, the fine arts, child development, are examples of fields which may be unpaid avocations or full-time vocations depending upon individual preferences and the situation in which the young woman later finds herself. Each requires breadth of background, a liberal outlook, and a thorough preparation rather than the narrow, trade-school training often associated with vocational work even of "professional" character.

Especially where a vocation has as yet not developed academic preparation beyond the undergraduate college Bennington will not hesitate to include training in the necessary minor techniques required for successful initial entrance. For example, stenography and typewriting can be pursued as incidental parts of undergraduate work in the case of those young women who plan definitely to enter the secretarial field after graduation. The type of intellectual asceticism which fears that contact with practice and reality will destroy the field for culture will have no place at Bennington. Breadth and thoroughness of work requiring sustained intellectual effort, whether directed toward a vocation or as preparation for leisure, will be the test of success at Bennington, rather than a program distinguished by its isolation from practical usefulness.

The breadth of outlook which has always been associated with the liberal college will be sought at Bennington in more than one way. Either during her school years or during her first college years each student will be introduced to the major fields of human achievement as a prerequisite to the intelligent choice of the field of her concentration. Once she enters upon her major work her training, so far as the College is concerned, will be broadly in a major field rather than narrowly in a department or a single subject of study within a department, as is sometimes possible in the latter years of existing colleges. Furthermore throughout her undergraduate life she will be in close contact with other students whose major interests differ from hers; thus she will constantly be subject to broadening influences. If during her last years she wishes seriously to follow interests entirely outside of her major she will be encouraged to do so. But instead of taking regular courses for this purpose she will arrange to do individual reading or other informal work. In this way, not only in the field of the major choice but in other fields, the methods are designed to encourage the habit of effectual self-dependence. Rather than follow a two-year period of required distribution of work by severely concentrated effort in the last years it is the plan at Bennington to encourage a broadening of interests and outlook along with the pursuit of a specialty so that both liberal outlook and specialization will be continued as a matter of choice after graduation.

A small residential college with easy opportunity for individual attention is the most favorable atmosphere for the early years when foundations are to be laid and intellectual interests awakened. But in the advanced work requiring specialized library, laboratory, and instruction facilities no small, independent institution can compare with the great metropolitan, artistic, intellectual, and university centers. Bennington College, recognizing this fact, will encourage its students to make full use of these metropolitan facilities for advanced work rather than itself attempt futile competition with them.

The College calendar is a first means to this end. In addition to a two months' summer vacation there will be a winter recess extending from Christmas through Washington's Birthday. For both faculty and students this provision gives an opportunity for travel, for non-resident field work in groups, and for participation in metropolitan life at its most active period.

During the last two years those students who, in order to explore their special fields, need facilities which the College cannot itself offer, will be encouraged to go to centers where there are the best opportunities for continuing major work under the general supervision of the College. This plan will apply to those who need laboratory research facilities offered by certain universities, those who wish to study national and international affairs in such centers as Washington, London, and Geneva, those who desire to study foreign languages and literatures abroad, or to gain access to the leading centers of art and music.

In many cases, probably in a majority, the facilities and staff at Bennington will be such that the student will continue in residence throughout the last two years. The utmost flexibility in making the best individual arrangements will be permitted. In all cases the Bennington faculty will retain supervision of the non-resident work leading to the Bennington degree. And in all cases this work will bear a direct relation to the student's general plan of study.

Some students may prefer to effect a complete transfer to another institution for receiving the degree. To this no objection will be raised. Until, however, existing universities permit much more freedom in curricular requirements for transferred students it can seldom be arranged with any degree of satisfaction to the students themselves. To facilitate complete transfer at the end of two years, Bennington would have to revise its curriculum so that its students could meet the host of formal, traditional requirements of other undergraduate institutions. This would strike at the heart of the College's fundamental educational program. If the Junior College and university reorganization movements eventually make such undergraduate transfer mechanically easy, Bennington will be in a position to reconsider its relation both to the schools and to the universities.

The Bennington degree will be awarded as the result of examinations, theses, or other tests designed to reveal objectively the accomplishment of the student in her field of major study. The degree of Bachelor of Arts will be given; no graduate work is contemplated.

The city university attended largely by day-students may perhaps of necessity limit its responsibilities to the primary intellectual activities connected with the curriculum. But a residential college cannot ignore the fact that it is an organized community rather than merely a place of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries only. For good or ill, on its campus young people are gradually acquiring habits of play as well as of work; they are modifying their modes of conduct, making fundamental mental and emotional adjustments, absorbing new attitudes, ideals, and appreciations.

Until the last generation college faculties held aloof from this student life outside of the classroom. In crude response, however, to a real educational need for practical activity, the students have been gradually building up an elaborate student-made curriculum. This extra-curriculum, neglected by the faculty although profoundly affecting the work of the classroom, has finally created an essential duality of organization and aim on the college campus.

On the one hand, there is the college of the faculty, centering in the classroom where instructors carry on their work with such ability, enthusiasm, and initiative as they possess. In this classroom world the students, by and large, play a rather passive part, using little initiative, exercising a small degree of imagination and self-direction. Step outside of the classroom, however, and one will see an amazingly different picture. Here are undergraduates engrossed in what are called student activities, exercising initiative, directing their own efforts willingly and enthusiastically toward their chosen goals. And in this world of the students the faculty plays a negligible or passive rôle. The juxtaposition of the two worlds on the same college campus causes friction and inefficiency. It is the primary task of those who are interested in the improvement of undergraduate life to bring about such reorganization as will produce nearer approach to unity of purpose.

Any attempt in this direction in an existing institution, however, meets with the greatest difficulty. Not only traditional faculty attitudes and institutional arrangements but the prejudices and vested interests of student groups and embattled alumnæ present almost insuperable obstacles to significant improvement.

Here, perhaps, even more than in the case of curriculum and method, is a unique opportunity for a new college. Bennington intends to take full advantage of it. By recognizing the value of many of the student enterprises, by basing the students' tasks upon their fundamental ambitions and interests, by setting up skill and understanding in a major field as a principal aim to which both curricular and extra curricular activity will contribute, the College will do much toward destroying the gulf now lying between student and faculty purposes. The athletic, dramatic, musical, publication, religious, and self-government enterprises of undergraduate life can, by intelligent guidance at the outset, be incorporated into the main intellectual and artistic program sponsored by the faculty. Trivial and merely imitative student organizations will probably be proposed; but if these do not fall of their own weight they can be effectively discouraged before they become fatally imbedded in institutional tradition.

Student social organizations, such as sororities or their equivalent, are the cause of much trouble in educational institutions because of their snobbishness and highly competitive struggles for a meretricious prestige. In place of them at Bennington a rational, inclusive social grouping of all students will be made in connection with the living and eating arrangements. Although the plan resembles that of the hostels connected with the newer English universities, it is an innovation in this country. Groups of approximately forty girls will occupy college houses, each student being assigned for her four year residence by a committee of students and college officers. In every house one or more selected faculty members will live, entirely free, however, from custodial or disciplinary duties. Each house will also have associated with it a number of other faculty members.

These arrangements will give Bennington an unusual opportunity to bring into natural, friendly contact people differing widely in maturity and background. The small residential college usually suffers because of a student body too homogeneous in viewpoint. The large university avoids this fault, but is unable to bring together its members with their divergent cultural and geographic backgrounds. Bennington will derive its varied student body from the operation of the selective scholarship plan, while its community life and atmosphere will lead to utilizing this variety for the healthy exchange of stimulating ideas and attitudes based upon real tolerance and understanding.

In time there will grow up in each house a corporate group with its own alumnæ, traditions, and individuality. Although the College itself is so small that many of its activities will cut across house lines, in the houses themselves there will be opportunity for informal education in self-government, group budgeting, household management, hygiene, and other problems developing out of the normal needs and interests of the students themselves. And out of these discussions there will in some cases evolve more formal elements of the curriculum.

The small size of the college body, the careful cumulation of accurate individual student histories, the conference method of instruction, and the regular contact between faculty and students, will provide increased opportunity for personnel work. Heretofore this term has been used to denote the activities of an expert staff dealing with individual students. It has developed most extensively in large institutions where mass instruction has cried out for an individualization of the educational process. It represents a tardy and partial recognition of the fact that any sound educational program must consider the whole personality, not merely its intellectual side.

The small, residential college has seldom taken advantage of its superior opportunities for this kind of service. At Bennington not only will there be expert staff guidance for the physical, mental, emotional, and vocational problems of the individual student but an attempt will be made to enlist the faculty and all the resources of the institution in the coöperative task of gaining a greater insight into the primary educational influences on modern youth.

The tastes, manners, morals, and ideals of the younger generation have become the subject of a veritable mythology. It is time they were made subject to patient, continuous, impartial analysis. The environment of the young woman to-day with its secularization of authority in manners and morals, its exciting, sophisticated modes of entertainment, its paradox of standardization and recurrent fashions forms an educational influence which few really understand but with which the teachers of youth must grapple.

The personnel problem in these broader aspects Bennington wishes to develop most of all to help the individual student under its charge, but also in order to keep its feet planted upon the ground of reality, to provide a continuous criticism of its own program, and to throw light upon weaknesses and values in education below the college level.

A faculty for an institution such as Bennington proposes to be is easy to describe but difficult to secure. Attention will be concentrated upon obtaining and rewarding really gifted teachers of undergraduates. To this end any merely traditional requirements regarding formal academic training, experience, and research will be willingly sacrificed. Since the attainment of the Ph.D. degree has proved in practice to be an irrelevant standard for determining teaching effectiveness it will not be used as an important basis either for appointment or for promotion. And although the faculty will necessarily be recruited largely from the younger members of the college teaching profession, there will be appointments of persons a part or all of whose training and experience has been outside of academic life. The essentials sought in appointments will be both a thorough understanding of, and an enthusiastic interest in — the teacher's special field, the individual students, and the principles and problems of modern education.

Although extreme care will be taken in original appointments, mistakes are bound to occur. Consequently, all first appointments will be made either to the lower grades with a one-year or three-year tenure; or to the full professorial grade where an arrangement will be made for a three-year appointment before promotion to permanent tenure. Permanent tenure in the full professorial rank cannot wisely be dispensed with. But every effort will be made to effect an intelligent, careful selection of those who are to be placed finally in this category. It will be the primary task of the President, aided by a capable faculty committee, to maintain a scrutiny of the effectiveness of the teaching staff with a view not only to giving helpful suggestions for improvements in method, but also to making discriminating decisions in the matter of all reappointments and promotions.

The College, reversing the usual order of determining faculty salaries, will first fix a salary scale based upon existing data regarding an adequate academic standard of living; tuition charges will then be placed at an amount sufficient to cover the salary total. If the salaries prove inadequate the tuition will be raised. From the outset experiment will be made with the adjustments of the salary to actual family needs (the family allowance system). This system is especially applicable to women's colleges where it has proved successful in actual practice as, for instance, at Wells College.

The opportunity for travel, freedom for independent work and for observation in intellectual centers, provided by the long winter recess and regular Sabbatical leave as well as the educational investigation fund described below, should contribute to the continuous intellectual growth of faculty members.

Institutions have too often begun well abreast of current educational thought and practice only to become in time stupidly complacent and set in their ways. Bennington will seek from the start all available means to avoid stagnation, to test its original hypotheses, and to revise its program in the light of its own and others' actual experience. Machinery designed to facilitate such flexibility has been adopted as follows:

(1) All of the Trustees are elected for a seven-year term, two retiring each year. The tradition of replacement at the end of a single full term has already been established.

(2) The President's resignation is in the hands of the Trustees to take effect seven years after the date of his original appointment. An advisory committee of outside experts will survey the College and report to the Trustees shortly before they act on the President's possible reappointment. By these and other careful arrangements the selection of his successor at this or any succeeding seven-year period can be made without embarrassment.

(3) The College proposes to establish a fund, the annual income from which will be at least $7,500, for investigations in the field of higher education for women. The annual award of the fellowship under the fund may be made either to a member of the Bennington faculty or to an outside expert. Normally it will be used for the investigation of a specific educational problem arising directly in connection with Bennington. It will provide the kind of thorough study necessary for the successful inauguration of educational experiments and the continuous scientific evaluation of their results in actual operation.

(4) In order to aid the President, Trustees, and Faculty to keep in touch with non-academic centers of thought and movement in the various professional and scientific fields with which the College is concerned the President is empowered to appoint advisors to be consulted on matters of general policy. The following are some of the fields in which advisors are being selected: the fine arts, music, drama, journalism, vocations for

women, natural sciences, medicine and hygiene, law, architecture, and religious education.

There is still abundant opportunity for revision and elaboration of the College program. There is a board of trustees and a President; a charter has been granted by the state of Vermont; a campus site has been pledged; a group of simple buildings has been planned; about one-half of the two and a half million dollar total necessary to get the project actually under way has been pledged. The educational task being purely qualitative the size of the student body for the first decade has been limited to three hundred and twenty-five, the smallest number consistent with reasonable faculty specialization.

Typical of the cordiality with which older institutions look upon the new institution is the following comment upon the Educational Plan quoted from the Harvard Alumni Bulletin: "As evidence of the drift of ideas in American higher education in the second quarter of the twentieth century, nothing could be more significant."

"If new ways are better than old ways, if the recent reforms adopted in American colleges are sound (and how can we of the present age believe otherwise?), then the future of Bennington College should be rosy indeed. Its first members should be filled with an exciting sense of novelty and high adventure which will stimulate both teachers and students to do their best. Though older institutions may shake their gray heads over so much youthful innovation, they will none the less wish the infant well, and watch her career with very close and interested attention."

PART FIVE

THE FORWARD LOOKING EMPHASIS

19

Dorothy Canfield Fisher

NEW LEADERS NEEDED

19

NEW LEADERS NEEDED

Dorothy Canfield Fisher

ONE OF AMERICA'S WELL KNOWN WRITERS

RECORDED history is little more than a fly speck at the end of a long long line which represents humanity's life on the earth. Most of us grasp that fact, thanks to the efforts of Wells, Van Loon and others who have labored to bring scientific sociology home to the multitude. Most of us are beginning to accept a few of its logical consequences. Human development, we see, has taken place much less rapidly than our fathers imagined. The important milestones are not battles, treaties, the rise of this or that empire, but man's hesitating advance in adapting his daily life to his own successes, — in adjusting himself to the world. The (probably) accidental discovery of fire, had to be (we guess from what we know about human nature) followed through thousands of years by a snail-slow rearrangement of everyday human life, before the new element was accepted as a natural part of everybody's daily routine. The transition from living in caves to constructing shelters (almost self-evident as the step now appears) must have been at first a shockingly radical idea. Only after eons of fumbling to and fro did the notion of a shelter for each and every family take root in the race-mind as something that every one ought to have out of life. The few centuries which bound the rise and fall of feudalism are as nothing compared to the slow appearance in every human brain of the conviction that clothing is a necessary part of living.

Such shiftings of human life from one plane to another are so gradual, are spread over so great a time, that no single generation has been able to perceive the general direction in which the race is moving, any more than a naked eye perceives the motion of a glacier. And even to-day with all our modern self-consciousness and means of measurement, we can only guess at what, to people as far from us as we are from the fire-makers, will seem the significant tendency of our century. Yet it is human to guess, to keep on setting our wits to the problem of whether or not our century has *any* real significance. Is it just marking time? Or has it already started on an advance which will alter the ways of thinking of coming generations as much as the use of fire, tools, shelter, the printing press, have changed the lives of past generations? My own guess is that the distinguishing mark of our period is the diminishing, in the lives of a very large number of people, of the amount of material effort needed to keep alive. Since the number of hours in each day have not diminished this means the appearance, in the lives of immensely more people than ever before, of time which they are not forced to use to meet the material needs of life. This widespread possession of some leisure time is — in the lives of the majority of mankind — as new as the possession of fire can have been to the first generations after its discovery. My guess is therefore that the next great problem of mankind is to learn how to use this new possession.

Let us look back at what has been known to us of human life up to the present. We see that an overwhelmingly large proportion of human beings have always been uniquely occupied in providing for material necessities. Securing enough food to keep human bodies alive and in health, focussing enough attention on sexual attraction to make sure of plenty of children, arranging enough safety to care for the children so that the generations might renew themselves, constructing and repairing enough shelters to protect the race from the elements. All through the earlier periods of human life it required almost a hundred per cent of humanity's efforts to meet such necessities. Our complicated interdependent modern society has developed from the various phases of this enterprise — the preservation of the life of our race — and for the most part has not advanced a step beyond it. Our forty-three-story buildings are only an adaptation of the original idea of shelter, our network of trains and ships and airplanes and canals, only variations on the theme of providing food, shelter, and clothing. Our most luxurious restaurants, with their exquisite fare, are on the same plane morally and spiritually with the man who threw the bloody carcass of a deer down on a cave floor. In essence, in spirit we are, most of us, on the same thought-level with the earliest skin-clad worker of flint arrows. We want out of life what he wanted — only more of it.

Little by little, the nimble wits of man invented all sorts of devices, such as agriculture and tools, division of labor and better transportation. These would have made it possible to secure the material necessities without giving all the time and effort of the race to get them. But to arrive at that point had taken a very long time. Untold generations of men had lived with the perfectly justified conviction that the choice lay between 100 per cent attention to material needs or death. A habit — portentous fact in human life always — had been formed. As often happens, what had been first a necessity became next a habit and then a rigid ideal or standard! It had for so long been necessary to give all his time to such things, that man came to conceive of meeting this need as his highest virtue. When he first found that food, shelter and clothing could be secured by means of various coöperative devices and inventions, without giving all of human energy to the job, he was confronted with a new problem — what to do with the margin of time and energy left over. He begged the question. His first solution was to complicate, refine and increase his material needs so that to supply them *would* take all of his time and energy. By this simple device he was able to keep from trying anything new, to go on living in the condition which had through ages of familiarity become homelike to his race, even though the real need for that condition was gone. This is of course the stage in which we are living to-day.

But from the first there have always been in each generation, a few individuals who could not be persuaded, often not even by harsh treatment, to give *all* of their time and attention to providing for their bodily needs. Give them enough to eat of almost anything, clothing sufficient for health, any sort of shelter — and they turned their thoughts away from food and drink and took up certain intangible activities of the mind. The majority of mankind has not known what to make of such exceptions to the rule. In early times those among them fared best whose reaction to the mysteries of life was that tendency towards unquestioning humble reverence in the face of the unknown which is called the religious temperament. The mystery of life is so overwhelming that it impressed the imaginations even of the majority, who were willing that the few men specially fitted for dealing with it should not be required to give quite all their time to the occupations of the rest of the race. For a long time the religious life was the refuge for all the men who sought some basic reality in existence beyond the life of the body, even for those men in whose minds the unknown stirred up the keenest curiosity, rather than humble reverence. Then, in later centuries, as the extremity of material necessity lessened, so that men felt less fiercely the need of all hands on deck, the danger of pursuing some life of thought outside of the religious life lessened. Men of non-religious temperament but also of non-materialistic temperaments began to drift away from religion to art, music, science. They have not been, materially, very well treated by their fellows, although not always positively persecuted as slackers and public enemies. The poets, artists, musicians, speculative thinkers of the race — Homer and Socrates and Aristotle, Spinoza and Rembrandt and Shakespeare, Beethoven and Shelley and Dante — have not all of them been ostracized and half-starved, but not one of them has been half as well treated as any successful general, as any woman especially gifted with sexual attractiveness. On the whole, they have been considered, as primitive tribes naturally would consider them, half-useless parasites fattening on people doing the real work of the world. (In speaking of the attitude towards them I am speaking of the great mass of mankind which has not advanced a step morally from the point of view of the early tribes for whom it was an actual treason to the race to give time or strength to anything but food, clothing, shelter and the propagation and protection of the young.) Poetry, music, speculation, art, none of it helped reap wheat or mend roofs or produce more children. Let those who practiced these idle pastimes do it at their own peril. Society felt little obligation towards them. They paid a penalty of hardship for spending part of their time in non-material pursuits. They purchased, in short, by personal deprivations, some leisure time to give to other occupations than making themselves or other people more comfortable. They were thus the first "leisure class," dating from the earliest periods of our history. And on the whole, though less physically comfortable than others, they have been admittedly the happiest specimens of the race.

They were presently joined by a second leisure class, the origin of which was entirely different. As time went on, it became harder and harder to find in the satisfaction of material needs, no matter how complicated, an occupation for *all* of humanity, all of the time. Vegetable food came to be secured more abundantly through agriculture, and flesh foods through the breeding of domestic animals. A widening of political agreements made local wars less incessant. The hunters and fighters who, because they were alike in being the wearers of weapons, had formed one class, were thus thrown out of jobs. As long as they had been needed, their work had been recognized by the rest of the race as so important that it was fair for other people to care for their daily material needs in return for the food and protection which they gave their group. Since they had long been the fighters, they had also long been the leaders, and had acquired the habit of command. Now any change in human habits takes place with so extraordinary a slowness that for centuries after these two classes of hunters and fighters were of very little use to society, they were still supported by others. They (you will recognize of course what is called "the hereditary aristocracy" of all countries) were thus the second class of human beings who, like thinkers, artists, priests, musicians, and writers, generation after generation stood outside the complete absorption in material needs which had become the fixed habit of the rest of the race. They were the second leisure class.

Now the first class — the philosophers, authors, artists, scientists, and sculptors — had voluntarily chosen their way of life, each for himself. It had not been secured to them by a change in the organization of society with which they had nothing to do. Not only had they chosen it of their own wish, but they had been willing to make some sacrifices to free themselves from giving all of their time to securing food, clothing and lodging. The leisure hours which they devoted to thinking, or singing, or painting, or experimenting were not granted them free. They paid for such leisure by not having as much as other people of what the majority of mankind wanted. And in their leisure they worked very hard at undertakings of their own. Their leisure was by no means another name for idleness.

The case of the second leisure class was quite different. When cattle breeding took away from hunters the job of supplying the meat for mankind, and when changes in government took away from the fighters most of their opportunities for their own kind of activity, it was through no wish or plan of theirs. They represent mankind's experiment in giving people idle leisure time — not leisure which they earnestly desired to carry on some cherished work of their own — but for which they had neither asked nor paid. Here is a laboratory experiment in a second kind of leisure for us to look at which has been carried on throughout a great many centuries. We see the age of machinery about to bring leisure time to a large number of people who never had it before and who have not been prepared for it by training in the right use of it. We do not need to use our imaginations to try to think what will happen to such people. We need only to look at what has happened to such a class in the past.

We see that people eager to achieve something in the intellectual or artistic or spiritual world thrive very well when given leisure enough to carry on such work. Their zest in life is more lasting and enduring and living than that of any other class. We see something very different when we look at the second leisure class, the ex-hunters and fighters who were pushed into idleness by a change in social organization. The majority of that class have not been able to think of anything to do with themselves except to go on with the old occupations, on which their primitive lives were based. There is something despairing about the way in which the aristocratic classes have always hung for dear life to fighting long after there was no longer any need for their fighting in protection of the society which fed them. They are always the bolsterers up of war, trying in a desperate instinct of self-preservation to keep that institution alive. In spite of their efforts, the intervals between wars grew longer. Outside enemies were less and less forthcoming. Well, if they had no enemies to fight, they would fight each other. And so they did, in jousts, tournaments and duels. It is a mere half-century since this last vestige of the Stone Age melted away. And against every imaginable difficulty they are still clinging pathetically to hunting. Nobody needs their game for food any more, there is no danger from fierce animals, it is increasingly difficult for any one to secure non-domesticated animals at which to shoot. But many of them seem to feel that between themselves and emptiness there stand only shot-guns and rifles. They have also complicated and multiplied all the material necessities of life to an insane degree, apparently also as a protection against emptiness. Food and drink and sex and fine clothes have been by them swollen to monstrous proportions. Through their habit and that of other classes they went on for some centuries being the professional governing class, until little by little that last usefulness was taken out of their hands and given to men strengthened by having experienced the normal amount of the need for effort.

It is of course only the majority of the aristocrats who during all these centuries have gone on hunting and fighting in a reflex gesture which is as out of their control as is the wiggling of a snake after its head has been cut off. What has the minority done? One would have expected that freed from pressing material necessities, this minority would have been to mankind a new source of supply of artists, poets, priests, speculative thinkers, musicians. Not at all. Quite the contrary. With the possible exception of Plato, not one single first-class creative mind has been developed in any aristocracy, of any country, in any period, under any circumstances. They have excelled over men who worked only when occasions for fighting were given them, and by Napoleon's time so little of their traditional instinct for military leadership had survived their forced inaction, that they were beaten at their own game by tavernkeepers, and blacksmiths' sons. Does this statement appear excessive to you? Run over the list of great names of all nations, in the arts, in the sciences, in thought. The facts are a matter of common knowledge. Shakespeare's father was a butcher. Goethe's grandfather kept a tavern. Dante's family were weavers, Spinoza ground lenses to earn his daily bread. Ibsen was an apothecary. Meredith's tailor ancestry is well known. Dickens —— ! Molière's father upholstered furniture. Newton was the son of a farmer. Descartes' grandfather was a doctor. Beethoven's mother was a domestic servant. From the highest rank of aristocracy there is not one first class name, throughout all the centuries. From the very lowest ranks, those not far above the commonalty, there are two, Shelley and Bacon. From the professional class many. From the class of expert tradesmen and fine artisans, very many. From the real proletariat, none at all.

Aristocrats have not even, as is occasionally said of them, provided the necessary appreciation for the great men of thought and art. The great artists and thinkers of the world have always been valued by large numbers of people, or else have managed to live as best they could, almost alone. There is no instance of a creative worker, valued solely by the aristocracy of his period, who turned out to be a first-rater. The artists, and writers and musicians who have been the particular darlings of the aristocracy and have been supported by them have usually been small and minor, usually trivial, most of them now forgotten. The great thinkers of the world have somehow managed as best they could to snatch enough bread and water to live on, protected and aided only by an occasional fellow-spirit, as eccentric as themselves. The aristocracies of the past have had centuries of exemption from material cares and as a class have neither produced nor appreciated the best things done by human minds. The fine disinterestedness about material welfare attributed to them seems to be for the most part the easy gesture of people whose material welfare is not risked by disinterestedness. Placed in the conditions of plebeian life, as by the sudden downfall of the Russian ruling class, they have showed themselves, naturally enough, as eager as any one else to get enough to eat. The contribution of the best part of this second leisure class to the common riches of human life, seems to be mostly pleasant manners, and a sense of "honor" which, although often preposterous in practice, has as theory been of value, being part of the discipline by which our race has begun slowly to learn the valuable capacity to give up immediate goods for the sake of more distant ones.

But compared to what the other leisure class has done for us, there is singularly little inspiriting or encouraging about the results of giving leisure time to a group of human beings without regard to their individual wish for it, rather than to this or that individual who wanted it enough for his own purposes to starve or freeze a little for it. After a long look back through the centuries at the depressing spectacle of hereditary aristocracy, one is tempted to cry, "No, no, that evidently will not do. It is plain that ordinary human beings cannot stand leisure time. Much better to keep the majority of mankind where it has always been, uniquely occupied with hard work to provide the material necessities of life. It is obvious that we cannot cope adequately with leisure time. Evidently, health and strength and sanity for the race lie in the old ways of enforced hard work!" But that is about as useful as if old people had cried (as they probably did) at the time when fire was first handled by man, "No, no, this is evidently a dangerous deadly new element in life, which will work us great hurt. We are not clever enough to cope with its evil possibilities. Much better leave it - - - - to a very few élite - - - - and arrange things so that most men live their peaceful old-time life without this unruly dangerous element." Fire has certainly done the human race a great deal of harm, just as such prudent wisemen probably thought, and it has proved far too dangerous an element for the simple members of the race to use with safety. But protests against its use availed as much as any protest we might make against the age of machinery, which insists upon supplying more and more of human bodily needs with less and less of human effort.

Whether we like it or not, leisure is creeping into lives which in earlier periods were not touched by it. Men who used to work fourteen hours a day, worked twelve, and ten, and now eight. And each one of them still has twenty-four hours to live through. Men who worked for six whole days a week and often for seven, find themselves first with a half-day of leisure, then with a whole day, in addition to Sunday no longer filled with church services. It has been proved that if *both* men and machines worked the old number of hours, they would smother the world under the resultant mass of manufactured products. Shudder as we may at the dangers of giving to large numbers of mankind the unwanted, unpaid-for leisure time which has been put to such trivial use by the classes of the past, who have had unasked-for leisure time, we cannot hold back the race from the perilous next stage before it. We might however resolve firmly that we will not simply repeat an experiment which has proved such a failure in the past.

We do not face this crisis, untaught by our race history. We have to warn us not only the example of hereditary aristocracy pining away to sickliness through its exemption from obviously useful work, but the further example of whole peoples who, not through machinery but through wealth and slaves, were a little relieved from the pressure of material needs, without any preparation for wise use of the resultant free hours. We see them, nation after nation, Crete, Greece, Rome, tried by the test of an existence that is materially easy, with no wide-spread intellectual effort to take the place of wide-spread bodily effort, and see them turn weak and flabby and trivial, and soon succumb to the attacks of some backward tribe who, not having learned how to provide for their needs in less than all of their time, still profit by the old régime of enforced hard work which for so long fostered human health and vigor.

But there are successes in our past as well as failures. And lessons learned from people who succeed have their value. On the whole the men of our race who when they stopped working hard at material undertakings have worked hard with their brains, have survived unhurt the change of régime. Each generation of man has had its thinkers and artists and students. Like aristocrats they did not submit to the old discipline of unlimited enforced hard work. But unlike the aristocrats they have not as a class dwindled and pined away, almost to total disappearance. They are just as relatively numerous, just as energetic and full of vitality now as ever, if not more so. We have had in our past two classes of human beings who have not been obliged to devote all their time to getting for themselves the material necessities of life, and helping their comrades do this. One of those classes has been remarkably successful and vigorous, and has incessantly renewed itself. The other class has wilted like a plant whose roots have been cut. Looking out into the future, we see that probably the age of machinery means that more and more people are going to live more and more in the conditions of life which have served aristocracy so ill and brain workers so well. Naturally we wish those increasingly numerous classes with leisure not to repeat the failure of the class which did not thrive, but to attain the success of those who have enjoyed leisure, used it profitably, and grown strong in it. A little more detailed consideration of the difference between the lives of those two classes in the past may help us in trying to steer our course away from failure to success.

When we looked at the list of men who have done great creative thinking of some kind we found that with extraordinary unanimity they spring, never from a very high rank of aristocracy, from which material necessity has been wholly excluded, never from the proletariat on whom material necessity incessantly presses. That would seem to indicate, wouldn't it, that a life in which there is still some, but not too much material necessity, is the healthiest background for the highest forms of human activity. The poorest classes can do nothing creative because they are wholly absorbed by material needs. The highest ranks of aristocracy can do nothing because too suddenly and violently divorced from the need for material effort which for untold ages was the only basis for human health. Does this not indicate in so far as we can plan our progress that we need to go slowly, helping every man to hold on to his share of the material need for effort which has always till now given mankind by far its greatest motive power? Except for a few remarkable minds and personalities, to lose all sense of material necessity seems to mean having one's dynamo stand still. This proven need of each individual for his share of needed material work, coincides with society's need if it is to go on progressing as a whole, not to permit any class to be crushed under too great material need, because it has been proved that that condition wastes human lives. Part of the work which in moderate amounts is essential for health must therefore be taken from them who have had too much of it, and allotted to the man who has had too little, and part of his leisure given to them, if we are to realize anything of the possibilities of our race.

There is, to put it mildly, nothing new in this ideal; but this is the first time we see it as one, not of philanthropy, *but of self-preservation,* as useful for the man who is to be made do his share of the work as for the man who is to be relieved of more than his share, and for the first time as a matter of vital importance to educators. Teachers will not have the brains in their classes on which to work, if machines are allowed, as wealth was allowed, to provide too much leisure for some and not enough for others. If the invention of machinery is allowed ----like the invention of ways to domesticate animals and raise grain----merely to take away from a class of human beings their old need for effort without giving them any other incentive to activity, we will simply be condemning another and much larger class of men and women to the slow inanition which, for so many centuries, has kept aristocracy from producing any great contribution to our common life. To teach the underpowered children of the leisure class has always been traditionally the dreariest work educators can have. Such children have as good natural outfit of brains as any one else, of course. Motive power is what they lack, because until now, and except in a minute minority, material necessity has been the only motive power known to ordinary people.

The lessons to be learned from the institution of aristocracy seems to be, very plainly, that human beings cannot endure too sudden and too complete separation from this necessity, which is like a moral vitamin. But the use of machinery is, every day, lessening the total supply of this vitamin in the world. Hence it is no work of charity but of life-and-death self-preservation to see to it that what is left shall be divided up more evenly than in the past. To help divide up the necessary and precious work thus becomes a definite part of the educator's program, if he is to stand loyally by the best interests of his profession. He cannot go on standing aloof from sociology.

He must try as ardently as any so-called radical, to make sure that this vital element of material necessity be shared by all. He must do his share in making people realize how precious this moral vitamin is. He must teach the young to treasure it and value it and use it, instead of trying to escape from it, as is the short-sighted impulse of mankind, intoxicated by any let-up in its age-old struggle with material necessities. Every person of intellectual ability who finds some material work that is honestly needed, and gives part of his time to it, showing that he enjoys it, is helping educate his fellows into a proper valuation of labor as a help to moral equilibrium in the new conditions of life. The educator needs to teach young human beings to hold fast to such activities, familiar and homelike with endlessly old associations, and for their own sakes to avoid too sudden a break with the old conditions, formerly the only ones in which human beings could thrive.

And he must make haste to come to the rescue of humanity in the matter of using the leisure time which, more and more, is being left over in the lives of more and more men, after material necessities have been cared for. The possession of fire itself was no more fraught with peril for the first generations (and the latest!) who tried to make use of it, than is the possession of leisure time. Just as our scorched and singed forefathers learned through tragic trial and error how to manage the tricky, delightful, treacherous, serviceable, murderous element in their lives, so we must learn, or perish, how to fill our leisure time by a transposition of the old conviction of the need for material effort, which has till now kept the race alive, into a conviction for the need for mental and spiritual effort. And in the teaching of this new effort, educators have, it seems to me, an opportunity for usefulness compared to which everything they have done so far is but trivial.

We have seen that a mixed lot of human beings, given unearned leisure time and a wide margin of strength, did not, of themselves, conceive the idea of giving their strength to higher forms of effort. There is no reason for thinking that any other human beings would react in any more purposeful way, if placed in the same conditions, unless they had been specially trained and prepared for this condition. Here, in the right kind of training, is work for educators which no other class can perform. Here is a danger with which engineers, who have done such marvels for our material life, cannot cope. It cannot be met, or even conceived, by the wonderful minds which have so masterfully organized transportation and trade. The lore of medicine will not avail here. It is an affair of the health of the intellectual life, and who but educators are charged with preserving that health? Not the most marvelous plumbing and electric system in the world will keep the owner of the house from being bored, if there is not inside his skull gray matter, informed, trained, and disciplined enough to keep him interested in life. The preparations of his brains to vanquish that boredom is the affair of those in charge of his education and of no others.

When men first began to use fire, they needed to help them cope with the new element, men physically bold, practically inventive, and doggedly determined to keep on in spite of innumerable defeats, for since fire still very often gets the better of us after all our long acquaintance with it, we can be sure that in the early days men must often have been despairing of ever being able to master it. We are in regard to the use of human leisure time apparently in just such a first stage of fumbling struggles with a new element, potentially magnificent, potentially deadly. And this time the men of merely physical courage and practical inventiveness cannot help us. Their work of leading mankind to the mastering of a new element must be taken over by educators, because there is no other class which can handle the tools needed.

Now humanity has not advanced to the edge of this new phase, all in one solid block, any more than it ever does. There are many stragglers far behind the rest, and a few pioneers and scouts, far in advance. The service of pioneers and scouts has always been to show that the way is open, that the difficulties and dangers, although real, are not insurmountable. Daniel Boone, returning alive from his land of promise beyond the mountains, made it possible for plain men and their wives to follow after and plant their homes there. We have in the realm of the intellectual life just such pioneers. I will take only one as an example, although there are others in almost every department of intellectual and cultural life.

Charles Darwin seems to me an almost perfect example of how to escape from the leisure class of frustration, dry-rot and ennui, into the leisure class of glorious life-loving vitality. An unearned income sufficient for his needs put him automatically into the dangerous conditions of the leisure class of idleness, in which so many fine personalities have drooped and lessened. He was totally cut off from the great tap-root of the need for material effort, the old tried and true source of human vitality. And yet his vitality did not diminish. He was not driven to the archaic pastimes of hunting and fighting, he did not need to dull the boredom of inaction by drink, gambling, more than his share of sexual life, or by the milder forms of aimless activity of amateur exploration or collecting stamps or glass bottles. He did not lose his zest in life as the physical vigor of youth waned. He never had any physical vigor to speak of, in youth or at any other age, but his zest in life grew sharper and keener with every year he lived. His life was filled with as keen and effortful an intensity of growth and struggle as that of any Daniel Boone tearing his living from the heart of the wilderness. Darwin too tore his living from the heart of the wilderness, the wilderness of human ignorance. No Indian tracker of wild animals acquired a more passionate attentiveness than did this sickly, well-to-do, English country-gentleman, who had, in the old meaning of the words, no incentive to effort at all. No woodsman, depending for his very life on the accuracy of his observation, lived up to a sterner standard of telling himself the truth about what he saw. No *coureurs de bois* ever fled from human enemies more fleetly, or turned and fought them more resolutely than this Victorian invalid, stationary in his comfortable home, fled from error or turned and wrestled with it. His life mentally was as tense with effort as the material life of a man cast away on a desert island, wholly dependent on his own efforts for survival. The excitement with which a matador, his little sword in his hand, bravely faces the gigantic brute strength of the bull, is passing and shallow compared to the excitement with which Darwin's little human mind and little human will pitted themselves against the gigantic mysteries of the physical universe. I often ask myself whether even the prodigious contributions to human knowledge of Darwin are equal in value to his example of what can be done with leisure time. Such lives as his and Pasteur's and others like them have blazed a path into the future, along which plain men and their wives and children may advance on the way to new homes. Such pioneers prove that devoted service of truth, disinterested desire to find out the ways of nature, can supply the motive power for life, as completely as the old daily need to get food.

Advancing into a new way of life is always accompanied by suffering. Humanity does not change its habits without pain, and it is not to be expected that the shift of emphasis from material effort to mental can be accomplished without much misery and homesickness for the familiar old ways. In the long process of adjustment to this diminution of material necessity, there will be suffering and unhappiness not to be alleviated by the wisest doctors, nor driven away by the wildest purveyors of amusement, but only by a reshaping of human minds, and this is of course from the beginning of time the work of educators. Not only people by nature unfit for the way of life will be eliminated after suffering, but, if care is not taken, many others who are simply slower to change. To minimize this pain and loss, leaders will be needed who understand what is going on, who are familiar with the path and with the destination, who will not only train those most capable of the new learning, but help and comfort those for whom the going is hard. Where can such leaders be found save among educators? Who but educators have an old familiarity with the path that leads to continuous mental effort, who but they are used to the theoretical consideration of life which lets them follow intelligently a movement which does not visibly exist? Who but they have been continually occupied, generation after generation, with the phenomena of human growth, and know the vast changes which through training and exercise and discipline it is possible to produce in human brains?

Now is their hour. The world needs them now as never before, because it faces a new crisis in which its old leaders are helpless. The new phase of life before humanity requires, if the race is to survive, more mental education than it has ever had, not only in its youth, but all through its life. Without a conviction of the need for effort the race degenerates. The machine age is reducing every day the need for material effort. If the conviction of the need for mental and moral effort cannot be substituted for what the machines are taking away, we are lost. Unless men can be prepared and trained for a life in which intellectual and artistic activity takes the place left vacant by the absence of necessary physical work, the ax will be laid at the roots of human life.

Whose business is it to prepare and train men for the life they are to lead? That sounds to me almost like a definition of education.

20

Ray Lyman Wilbur

HIGHER AND HIGHER EDUCATION

20

HIGHER AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Ray Lyman Wilbur

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR IN THE HOOVER CABINET
AND PRESIDENT OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY

THE expanding wealth and increasing leisure of the American people have permitted an unprecedented growth in institutions of higher learning and in the numbers of students who are at least exposed to advanced training. There is much evidence that this growth has been rank as well as rapid, and that we have gorged the traditional college with students, many of them taking work for which they were illy adapted and much of which was given to them by methods savoring of the antique. The placid four-year college of traditional American fame, with its simple and rather elementary curriculum in classical, historical and mathematical studies, received its first sharp jolt when impinged upon by the laboratory. So startling was the effect of the laboratory and its findings upon much of our educational training and upon our civilization, that it soon forced its way inside of college walls, then down through the high schools, even into the elementary schools, while at the same time it was growing rapidly up into some of the professional departments of the universities. The attempt to maintain the integrity of the four-year college unit in the face of rapidly changing conditions has now brought the American college into a position where it is being depleted from below through the expansion of the high school into the junior college, and drawn upon from above into the university because of the increasing calls from civilization for adequate training for a more responsible citizenship.

With plans made for the whole population to attend school up until at least the early teens, elementary education is being revamped. When children are forced to go to school, whether they want to or not, and whether the particular kind of training given is profitable to them, most thorough segregation of elementary students into groups of approximately equal capacity is requisite for success. There is a steady movement in this direction which, like many human things, began first with the subnormal rather than with the superior student. A somewhat similar process is taking place in the college period, where the comparatively easy entrance requirements and social emphasis upon college education has brought in thousands of students taught in large classes, a large percentage of whom do not profit by the methods used or gain much from the time spent. The wastage is very high.

It seems to me that it would be much more intelligent to develop certain units such as the junior high school, the senior high school perhaps combined with the junior college, the junior college and then the university with its various advanced and professional degrees. If the college is to keep step in general culture it will have to add another year for its better students. These divisions would permit a series of stopping places so that the desire to complete a course once entered upon could be satisfied and individuals could try themselves out to see whether it is worth while for them to go forward for advanced or specific professional training.

The American University is dragged down by its present heavy burden of elementary college work. Students entering large universities giving elementary college work are often handicapped more than they would be if handled in smaller groups elsewhere. In the public school system the extension upward of the high school from three to four years and then to the junior college is significant. In fact this public support of higher education supported by the action of districts and states is spreading rapidly and constitutes one of the striking achievements of higher education in America. In effect it distributes the elementary work of the state university into a number of smaller local units. In these there can be smaller classes, more intensive instruction, while the requirements of library, classroom and laboratory are comparatively inexpensive and simple. The vast expenditures needed for research can be reserved for the university proper. We can see coming from it the opportunity of more students to test their capacities and their vocational aptitudes on the one hand, and on the other, more freedom for the American university to develop to a higher point the advanced work and the professional schools absolutely vital to the welfare of a democracy which must depend upon the expert for its security and progress.

The giving of more training to the great masses of men in all parts of the world, together with the application in a practical way of the new facts found through research, has led to a change in our environment that has been more rapid and more dramatic than has been seen in any other period of the history of the human race. As we expand into any new field or use any new discovery or fact in practical life, the need for an increasing number of experts is obvious. Any one could light a candle, and almost any one could make one. But it requires great specialization for us to drop water from a height on to a turbine and carry that power transformed into electricity through various contrivances and wires to the distributing system of an electrical light company. It takes no more capacity to turn on the electric light than it does to light the candle, but if the expert is left out of the intermediary states between the falling water and the light bulb, we may have destruction rather than service. The rules under which electricity operates must be learned in the schools. This applies to a whole series of inventions now in daily use.

Our control of nature then, now very extensive and constantly expanding, brings us wealth, comfort and power, but it is a control which we must exercise through those specially trained. So many elements of our civilization are now involved that there must be a constantly increasing period of training of the most detailed character for many of our students to keep our communities operating at a high degree of efficiency. For instance, in the field of medicine, it was a comparatively simple thing a generation ago for a student who could read and write, and who had ordinary intelligence, to enter a two-year lecture course in medicine, perhaps even without high-school training, and receive the degree of doctor of medicine and begin practice. Usually the first year was simply repeated in the second year. No hospital training was required. Many older physicians now practicing have just this training. The dissection of the human body and some work with *materia medica* comprised the most practical phases of the work aside from the direct contact with patients.

Since the discoveries of Pasteur, and the work of Lister, and those great men of science who followed them, we have expanded the medical course so that after a high-school training at least two years of advanced work in physics, chemistry and biology are required before a four-year medical course, filled with laboratory work in chemistry, physiology, bacteriology, pharmacology, etc., and that in turn followed by one or more years in a hospital before the doctor's degree is given and before licenses for medical practice are granted. It only takes a moment to compute the great increase in time, expense, machinery, institutional equipment, that has been required to meet the inevitable demands in this field, all based upon necessity. The physician of to-day must meet the public demand by better training which must be continued on through his whole professional career. Similar requirements are made for the training of the engineer and the lawyer, the business executive, the teacher, and the experts required in every field. Various devices in the way of so-called post-graduate schools, national organizations with papers and conferences are being used more and more to keep trained men in touch with progress.

During our more simple rural days with the unit of the family together with the farm, and the small manufacturing town with its water wheel, we built up a political system appropriate to such conditions. Now our political system must accommodate itself to the astonishing changes existing on all sides. This in turn requires new conceptions in education and in the activities of many branches of the colleges and universities.

Above all, in education, we must consider the individuality of the pupil and mold our educational system to him, rather than to have him over-molded by the educational process. Mass education of the type we have indulged in has submerged the individual, has failed to stimulate ambition adequately and has turned out many of our population with certain mental patterns. It is inevitable that we should have mass education at certain levels of our educational scheme. But when we approach the college level, and particularly when we approach the advanced work of the university, beginning roughly with our so-called junior year, every effort must be made to individualize the things that we do for our youth. We must try to get the right student and the right teacher brought together. We must try to discover the strong points of the student, rather than to insist that he spend all of his energies in trying to pass subjects that some one thinks he ought to have and for which he may have no real mental equipment.

We advance most by developing our strong points, not by having our whole energy absorbed in trying to cure so-called weaknesses. These are not necessarily weaknesses; they are differences. For some reason we have conceived of an educational entity and then tried to have all of our students conform to it. As a matter of fact, the entity is the student not the curriculum. The mind of each one is different from that of the other. The most striking thing in all life, it seems to me, is that the Creator has worked out a method of combining the chromosomes so that every individual is different from every other individual. The university should discover these differences, rather than to endeavor to force all students to be alike. The elective stystem has been a step in this direction. It allowed too free scope and has permitted mediocrity to go too far by offering too many elementary subjects over too long a period leading to a degree. The sharp distinction, it seems to me, comes at the point when advanced work begins and when the student must build upon his previous training as he goes forward. The temptation has been to expand the subjects within the traditional four-year course so that mental mediocrities could readily complete an educational cycle which is more social than educational.

Higher education is just in its beginnings in this country. It is far from finished. The insistent demands of a changing and developing social order, combined with the vast information already available and the new facts constantly brought in by research workers, will compel many shifts and changes. We should welcome experimentation in this field, both in methods of teaching and content of courses, and in the general set-up of higher education. Time will bring us many things, but it will not bring us a decreasing responsibility in higher education, for unless there is some great economic and social débâcle it will become higher and higher in its range and scope.

II - Chr. ed.

Higher ed. faces
the future.

LA226 .S33
Higher education faces the future; a
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00026 0705